

The  
**Hitler Taboo :**

a study of linguistic force in operation,  
based on a reading of Musolff's *Metaphor, Nation  
and the Holocaust*

by

**Howard Hill**

**Godless House**

**Thursday, 27 March 2014**

The full title of the book at the centre of our attention here, is *Metaphor, Nation and the Holocaust : The Concept of the Body Politic*, by Andreas Musolff, 2010. From the outset we understand that this work is about the Hitler Taboo, as this idea of linguistically *manufactured* taboo has appeared in my Atheist Science philosophy posted to Scribd over recent years. But upon settling down to read the actual text we immediately discover that Musolff's book is not really *about* the Hitler Taboo at all, because it is more than this, it *is* the Hitler Taboo in action ! And from this realisation we understand that the other key ideas presented in my Atheist Science philosophy, most fundamentally that of a 'linguistic force' creating all social form, are likewise shown in action, by Musolff's work of taboo extension.

In point of fact we should not be surprised by this revelation at all, since one of the primary insights of our Atheist Science model of human existence tells us that individuals do not exist, that the human animal is the superorganism composed of individuals. This is an easy observation to formulate, but its consequences in real life are none on impossible to keep in mind continuously, in that first and foremost, this means that nothing that anyone does is done *by* them ! How can it be if they do not exist ? That is what nonexistence means in this human context.

The clue to resolving this curious turn of interpretations, is to be found in the insight we just noted applied to the specific case of Musolff, as he handles the subject of how Hitler's ideology of antisemitism came to be. The point is that the human being, the superorganism, is organised via the action of linguistic force that generates linguistic forms, the sum total of which is the message of its own being. This 'message' is what we share in our daily lives and think of most pointedly as 'knowledge', using this term in its broadest possible sense as referring to all that we 'know'. From this it follows that everything 'we' do, is in reality 'done' by the human animal through the medium of its *message of being*, or *message of identity*. This idea will be dismissed by all as absurd, naturally, otherwise the entire process whereby we evolved to be units of a living being would not work. But in this modern scientific age we are used to seeing beyond the immediate, although not in regard to ourselves, where it really counts. If it were not so that it is the whole being of social organisation that animates individuals through a linguistic formula, then it would be impossible to account for all that we live by in society, most especially that most important nonsense, religion. The upshot of which is that we do not think, anything, we merely respond to the message that is preserved as the identity of the human superorganism we belong to. And this certainly fits with the fact that we can have a huge intellectual edifice like that of Darwinism, typifying advanced science and freedom of thought in a scientific age, that is supported by millions of professional intellectuals, and admired as the greatest of scientific achievements, when in reality it is no more science than any other work of pure fiction is, such as *Alice in Wonderland* !

So that in Musolff we have a direct example of this process of superorganic physiology in action, generating a core feature of its identity programme vital to the integrity of its living form, as our work here should illuminate. The Hitler Taboo is the term we give to the historical actions of Nazism that now act as a stern prohibition against anyone abusing the master race, the Jews. The Nazis made the master race their special victims, naturally, thereby delivering a new formulation of a key part of the message of corporate identity that gives the human superorganism its living being under the identity of Judaism. Musolff is acting in accord with this taboo, but it is clear to us who see this subject as a taboo, and not as that which it purports to be, namely an historical event simply of its time, rather than being an intense phase within an ongoing process, that Musolff is not detached from the subject he is working with, but rather, he is *part of* the subject he describes. In such a narrow, specifically defined case, we can easily explain this idea of 'taboo' as opposed to 'knowledge', and the latent potential within this explanation is the key factor of *individual nonexistence* mentioned

above. But in highlighting this *factor of nonexistence* to make it visible to all, we can now say that clearly this mode of representation where *part of* a human social object feigns separateness, not to say outright antagonism, is an ever present conceptual conversion applied to all that takes place amongst ourselves, as it is driven by the power of language that creates our world, and our consciousness of that world. And this is so because by generating infinitely varied acts of separation as nothing more than linguistic formulations, the human social biomass that is the substance of the superorganism is given a complex, tightly integrated anatomical structure, exactly as we see in the world all about us, and study under a proliferation of names, many thousands of names indeed. Names of nations, religions, ideologies, activities, delinquencies, illnesses, how many categories of human identification are there ! Too many to count.

This factor of nonexistence then relates to the core principle of alternative pivots of observation that lies at the heart of our Atheist Science Philosophy, whereby we begin to construct our ideas on the basis that the individual does not exist, because the true being of the human animal is the superorganism that is composed of individuals. Therefore nothing that any of us ever does, or thinks, is done, or thought, by us, *our* actions can only ever be those of the living being that we are part of, in the act of being expressed *through* us. This of course is a perfectly naturalistic, detached model of human biological nature, and as such it is the perfection of science applied to humans, it is the antithesis of all knowledge as we know it, and it is therefore an atheistic, as in an *anti-knowledge*, as we have it, model of knowing, it is, in other words, an Atheist Science.

04/05/2014 10:52 – **Is it more rational to believe in God ?** is the question being debated on BBC 1 *Big Questions* now, and the token atheist is speaking, she just said atheism is a belief system !!! Arrrgh, makes you mad. She teaches evolutionary science and seems to of previously stated that there is no inherent connection between atheism and science – WHAT !! As I came into this discussion they were just discussing whether the self is an illusion, an idea they denied of course, having no idea what such a question could possibly mean, no doubt. This programme is of course part of the backbone of the message production structure of the Jewish superorganism that all humanity belong to now. “Science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.”, some author against atheism just said, quoting Huxley, but what do these jerks think Darwinism is for crying out loud if not a creed ! Nothing can shift this false model of evolution designed and implanted by the intellectual class of our slave society, because it is not science, it is dogma serving religion by filling the void where true science belongs, Atheist Science indeed. Darwinism sure ain’t science, for if it were there could be no more creeds, that is the whole point about science, and why science and atheism, when the science is genuine, are inevitably one and the same thing, in different modes of attention. These idiots have no idea that science does not exist, that it is perverted to sustain religion, and this is what has led me to produce Atheist Science. Now they are blaming terrorism in the name of religion for the *decay* of religion, even though religion is growing massively stronger and Islamic terrorism, as with Nazism formerly, both of which ideologies have religion at their core, is the proof of this.

When they were discussing belief, a women interjected that there were things that science could not account for, such as filial love. Another twat, a Muslim, said atheists could not deal with the Koran because in order to do so they had to be able to read Arabic ! Ha!! I did not catch his opening words but presumably this was justified on the basis that the Koran was given by God in Arabic. Whatever, back to this deeply ignorant, stupid women. This idea that science cannot explain things of value is just regular philosophical crud, in this case the correct response to this idiot was to say to her that she was *being herself* when asserting that her ideas were self validated and as such beyond any external intellectual knowing above

her own judgement. But from a scientific perspective she was an 'object' to be understood, and as such, she could be understood as surely as any other object. So she was not saying anything that *explained herself*, she was *being herself*. And this is the constant response we must have to all such notions of self validation, that are the essence of what individuals espouse when they are being the objects of superorganic being, that they indeed are. Now, in order to have this true explanation *of* an act, as opposed to *an act of* explanation that is an act of being an object, we do need a point of detachment, and this is obtained by understanding that the individual is not a being in their own right, but that the being in its own right they relate to, is the human animal, the superorganism. The self, does not exist, in other words. With this established point of detachment we have a basis upon which to interpret all that any individual does, and that is all there is to science/atheism explaining anything, and everything. Of course this discussion leads us to a theoretical style statement applicable to saying that Musolff does not explain Hitler, but rather he continues Hitler's work of defender of the Jews via the manufacture of taboo.

---

We have the startling subversion of history applied by Musolff from the outset, as he forces the modern history of the idea he is working on, concerning the 'body politic', to appear in an entirely false form that historically applies to different eras, and most particularly, utilises the false pivot of observation that is another key idea in my atheist philosophy of human biological nature.

That the Nazis brought the idea of society as a natural phenomenon into disrepute is a most important subject within the arguments we have developed concerning the way that our discovery of human biological nature explains human history, most especially as it bears on the topic of religion. But for ourselves the relevance of the organicist view of society to Nazi ideas has been properly synchronised with the real history of the idea of society as an organism, as seen in the phrase 'social organism', which idea definitely *did not* relate to the somatic body of the person, but rather, did relate to the contemporary scientific ideas of the living body understood as a biological phenomenon. The significance of which alternative view of the social body, lies in the hierarchical level of the application of ideas, so that instead of seeing social structure in terms of organs of the body and gross phenomenon like unity and sickness, the scientific idea gives a functional view wherein individuals are all cells appearing in different forms, serving the alternative structure/organs of a unified heterogeneous living form, where the whole is the only real being and the parts are all functional units thereof.

What Musolff is doing is forcing the organicist sociology informing the Nazi ideology of the collective state to fit the somatic view of the social body famously presented by Hobbes in the seventeenth century, in a disingenuous act of deliberate perversion of historical fact, that shows his work to be an extension of the Nazi ideology acting as an aid to the Jewish master identity, by virtue of its politicising science by drawing science's model of society into orbit about the individual, which science properly represented denies any existence, exactly as Nazi ideology did in fact do.

So what we find upon setting about reading Musolff is that his work tells us how the Nazis were created by the biological action of linguistic force acting as a social pressure of linguistic expression, contained within a social structure formed to serve exactly this result, that is to subvert truth of reality as it is, wherever it conflicted with religion as it is. This subversion simply requires that the false pivot of observation that lies at the centre of religious knowledge's fabrication be placed at the centre of any scientific ideas that come along, so that they are automatically, and subconsciously politicised, by being made the

consequence of individual actions, and as such made inexplicable to science because there can be no uniformity of reason behind social activities that all originate in actions of individuals.

Yesterday, 15/05/2014, a copy of *The Body Politic* by Barnes, 1866, arrived from America, nice condition, costing just eight quid, how good is that ? Flipping this book open now I find myself at chapter six, *Modes of National Growth*, which is actually a nice spot to discover Barnes' meaning in applying an organic model to society, for he expressly states that society is not a natural, living thing, like "animal and vegetable life.", and "There is no mysterious working of a "vital force," associated with it." (p. 47.) The reasons for events occurring within society are simple, mechanistic, with cause being easily connected to effect, he says, so that he certainly is using the classic 'body politic' idea, as in Hobbes model. This is the one Musolff works from and applies to Hitler's organicism. But it most definitely is not the one I have been immersing myself in for over a decade now, based upon the idea of the 'social organism', which is the one Hitler was under the influence of when developing his truly organicist version of a master race ideology. And this superficial 'body politic' model of society used by Barnes is of course utter nonsense, as our Atheist Science ideas more than amply demonstrate, not least in the way we show that Hitler was in truth created by the master identity of Judaism. Who would call that fact obvious, and connect the effect, Nazism and the holocaust, with Judaism and Jews ? It is only *obvious* once we have a true pivot of observation to work from, telling us that the individual does not exist and we must look to an underlying force, the force of information, which is the true 'force vital', appearing in society as 'linguistic force'.

Yesterday, 16/05/2014, a copy of *The Way We Think* by Fauconnier and Turner, 2002, arrived, and it truly is as good an example of science in a *scienceless* world, as we could wish to see, or rather, not wish to see ! I mention homing in on this title below, prompted by the bizarre jargonised ideas Musolff employs as a 'scientific' foundation for his distorted history of Nazis sociological organicism. The idea was to get a foothold on the cognitive mantra from which he drew his peculiar way of talking about ideas being 'mapped' onto targets and such like. But upon examining this work briefly, we find it actually gives us some stuff about the origin of language, which is an area that is always of the greatest interest to ourselves since language is the key to human corporate biological nature making us superorganisms, by projecting the flow of biological information beyond the individual to form a superorganic, that is, a social space. Naturally the talk is all of immense mystery, and solutions so inscrutable that wrestling with them gives infinite delight, but little certainty. Well what do you know, that is them damned divine creatures defying all understanding again, aren't we amazing !

How an organ of grammar could of evolved via a genetic process, as it must of done, baffles these priests, but without understanding what the human animal is and how language is the anatomical mode that made the person vanish, to become a cellular unit of the living human animal, these people will always be floundering in the dark. What they need to understand is that language is a medium of corporate being acting at the level of social organization, by organising people. Thus racial identity is just as much linguistic in this functional sense as any spoken idea of the kind we operate under today. So that a host of anatomical features would of been at work in reducing the somatic human form to a cellular object of superorganic being, a transition directed toward this outcome that would account for the means by which a grammar generating anatomy emerged from the latent potential of hominid mammalian form.

My posting to Musolff upon first obtaining his book

Hi Andreas, I have just purchased a copy of your Metaphor, I was thrilled to bits when I hit on this item as I have been writing about this topic for years, ever since I discovered the nature of the human being was that of a superorganism. This soon enough led me to the Nazis and the Jews as core matters of interest in understanding this topic. Once one has discovered the idea of the superorganic in application to humans, and confirmed its scientific correctness, the real mystery becomes how this fact is not known. It took me a couple of years to find a clue that opened the path to answering this question after my initial inspiration, so you see, to find a book like yours which concerns itself so centrally with this issue is fascinating. Obviously I avow the reality of the human superorganism, it is after all utterly irrefutable, whereas you refute it, as a professional academic that is job, but I thought

I'd fire off an email as I just found your address while looking for an essay of yours from your bibliography.

I was just checking out a title from your bibliography by Sperber, which pretends to offer a naturalistic approach to understanding culture, but obviously does no such thing, if he had then it certainly would not of been published, and he would of been dismissed from any professional posts he holds just for writing such a piece of scientific truth.

I am approaching 60 and I have spent my life since childhood animated by the conundrum of religion existing in our world, which I longed for resolution according to a scientific idea. If we take the idea that the human animal is a superorganism and the individual does not exist, then we obtain a means by which to understand every detail of human existence, giving us the holy grail of a true anthropology. This idea soon occurred to people as the newly enlightened minds of the burgeoning scientific era turned to humans, as we see with Comte's sociology, and the century long interest in sociological organicism which followed, until the idea was erased about the time of the first world war and then made taboo by the second.

Anyone faced with the idea of the human superorganism who has an interest in understanding humans cannot fail to realise that this is the correct scientific solution. The implications of this fact are considerable. First and foremost, Darwinism is then revealed not to be science, and it never was, it was always a sterile form of science whereby nature was made in man's image and all ideas pertaining to ourselves were subverted to ensure that the status quo could persist, exactly as it has. In saying which we do not invoke anything to do with conspiracy, but rather a natural social process of knowledge control, of which someone like yourself is a central part, unwittingly though, I trust.

Thus the great revelation coming from Darwin was that man was an animal, obvious, certainly, but up to then never allowed to be freely stated in an authoritative form. But this form fixed itself upon the false pivot of human individuality, the core of our religious ideology. The human animal is in truth a superorganism, and the individual does not exist. This is so obvious it beggars belief that academics can go about spouting all they do in total contradiction of this obvious fact, obvious once you have seen it. However the tolerance of religious belief seen in intellectuals prepares for this perplexing fact.

The upshot of this revelation of Darwinism's none scientific nature is searingly devastating. The core of my being has been defined by an ideological atheism, but my atheism is sincere, unlike that of pretenders like Dawkins, who prance about on the public stage taking the mantel of atheism upon themselves, while serving religion by always adhering to the principle at the core of religion, which says the individual is the human being. I am an ultra individualist, but this causes me to hate being subject to any kind of authority, so first and foremost I want to know the truth, I want to know why I am pressed by authority on every side, I do not want to preserve my individuality at all costs, as Dawkins does, by subscribing to a myth that grants individual being, I want truth.

When I found your book the blurb on it said you warn that this persistent idea of the organic nature of society continued to pose a threat, well indeed it does, because it is scientific truth juxtaposed in opposition to religion/authority. In my work as an atheist philosopher, self styled, I have reached the point of understanding these ideas where I call this knowledge of our true biological nature 'unknowable'. I know it, I have written profusely on the subject

and posted my materials online, on Scribd, and people have had the opportunity to view these if they wished, so others can 'know' these ideas. Obviously the idea that human society is an organic phenomenon has been of considerable influence in past times, though its promotion is not freely accessible nowadays.

The reason this idea is dangerous is because it is correct, when we live in a world built of ideas that are mythical, but functional, of course. If we recognise that individuals do not exist, as ends in themselves, and the human animal is a superorganism that the somatic human form evolved to bring into existence, as surely as bees produce hives and ants result in nests, then some very challenging ideas ensue. As an atheist these ideas delight me, they prove that God does not exist by showing what God is, the superorganism, and, still of delight to me, they also show more difficult things, such as what different religious identities are. This revelation leads to the inevitable annihilation of our society as it exists today, and that cannot be allowed to happen, hence, although I have recognised where these ideas lead, as others did when the idea of the social organism was abroad, I have also seen that if this idea is in the public domain it can only have one outcome, which is to cause mayhem in a process of social cleansing, to recover a state of balance where this knowledge is no longer available as an accepted idea.

This balanced outcome requires a two pronged development, it requires that the truth be erased and suppressed, and that it be replaced by a pseudo form. It is clear that what we are concerned with here are two forms of core foci from which logic is to be turned into knowledge, one that takes the false pivot of individuality, and another that takes the true pivot of corporate being that recognises that the human animal is the superorganism. These are mutually exclusive alternatives. If we take the true pivot then in the end all will be known, and all illusion will be made impossible. Whereas if we take the false pivot then no matter how wonderful the proclamation of intent, such as that found in Sperber or Dawkins, the result will be complete and utter rubbish, which will allow the false knowledge upon which social fabric is based to persist.

So you are right to say that this persistent idea continues to pose a threat, but I have only read your bibliography so far, so I have not had a chance to see what allusions you may have made to this idea of danger in sociological organism. But the real reason is more subtle than anything you can possibly of stated, because the core idea is unquestionably true, after all we are animals that arrived a blink of an eye ago in evolutionary time and what we do can only be a product of what nature made us to do, and every detail of our lives asserts this fact, if we look at ourselves with a true scientific eye. But, if this idea is made to dominate society again as it did during the later nineteenth century, then it will require to be erased again, and that will require another Hitler, and no person wants that. But the reality is that Hitler, seen in this light, can be fitted into the functionalist model associated with Durkheim, who notably said that if crime did not exist then it would need to be invented because of the stimulus it gives to social integration. In order for religion to persist as the ruling authority it must do so by continually surviving a process of social cleansing, this is because religion is the identity of the superorganism and social identities compete to for their position as the existing form of identity, all religions being equally false they must have behavioural routines built into them that give them durability, that is higher functionality. What this means is that for a religion to become dominant it must actually promote social cleansing which it is adapted to survive, rather in the manner of parasites inducing identity forms that suit its purpose, along the lines discussed by Villarreal in *Origin of Group Identity* perhaps. This is not an analogy, a metaphor, or any other such linguistic device. I assert that the human animal is a



superorganism, a scientifically recognised animal form, and I mean nothing analogical in this, I deny the existence of the person as an animal in their own right. That there are structural consequences of this fact, revolving around human social identities, is inevitable, and therein lies the tragedy of history.

So in reality the idea of society as an organism is not the problem, in and of itself, but rather human biological nature is the problem, if you wish to put it like that, and get to the root of the matter. Our biological nature forces us to live under the unifying influence of a religious identity, and this must be preserved at all cost, and the method our religion used to create our world carried a component within it of social cleansing inducement, which it was built to survive. So, it is our religion which carries the fatal component that causes the likes of Hitler to come to the fore and utilise the age old mechanism of social cleansing linked to our religious identity, as in antisemitism.

Yours, Howard Hill

07/04/2014 19:06

## Chapter 1

### Introducing Atheist Science

Atheist Science is a philosophy of knowledge based upon an alternative pivot of observation, that is, a fixed, central idea, from which all ideas are interpreted. The current pivot of observation lying at the core of social authority is taken for granted as an unspoken fact, because it is the assumption delivered to the people living under the social authority that rules our world. That pivot of observation says that people existing as individuals, you and me, are human beings. In naturalistic terms this means that we are the objects of human evolution, each existing as an integral human animal living in our own right, for ourselves. This 'individuality' is an unspoken assumption upon which all our ideas depend, because they have been formed in obedience to this 'assumed fact'. This assumption is however entirely incorrect. Atheist Science could then be said to be all about correcting this 'error'.

**The alternative pivot of observation and interpretation from which Atheist Science is derived, has the human animal as a superorganism *composed* of persons.**

Wherefrom we obtain the central fact that the human being, or 'individual', is the superorganism, and the 'individual' as we take them to be in our world does not exist, *as an end in themselves*. This means that persons are not animals in their own right, they are an animal kind, but they are not animals, because the human animal is a superorganism. This shift in the mode of interpretation of all things human has enormous consequences, and it is a subject of immense importance and significance in terms of our understanding of existence. We could say that the whole point of generating knowledge on the massive scale that we do in our society, is simply to tackle the problem of a competing foci of true perspective, that must be shut out of existence so that the real reason for knowledge existing can prevail, which is to create a core social authority, a living human being in other words.

The effect of this effort to control knowledge through the manufacture of false knowledge aimed at suppressing true knowledge, has been to create social structure, the very fabric of the living human animal in fact. This, rather amazingly, is how linguistic force works to create living form according to a strictly natural, biological process, arising from the evolution of an articulate mammal that has evolved the power of speech in order to deliver a superorganic mammalian form existing at the level of the social organisation of biological information, in the linguistic form of knowledge.

The generation of social structure from linguistic force acting as a generator of knowledge serving to create and sustain social authority, means that large scale physical structures exist to represent the central objects of this process of superorganic being. Accordingly when we set two alternative foci of knowledge creation in opposition, and call one a generator of false knowledge that creates all social structure, and the other a generator of true knowledge that acts as a covert source of information for the false pivot to draw upon, we can point to the social consequences of this underlying physiological dynamic, and this gives us the age old opposition between religion and truth, which nowadays can be seen in the war of religion against science, which is in abeyance for the moment because religion is the all out victor, at the moment, as it usually is indeed,

In much of my previous work I have written about the war of religion and science, and the creation of false knowledge as the basis of social power, and how modern knowledge has been controlled by subversion rather than outright suppression, as was formerly practised and is still practiced in some places. But another aspect of this story of knowledge as an expression of linguistic force, that generates superorganic form in the shape of social structure, is key to this whole biological process as we know it in the modern world, as characterised by the word ‘civilisation’. A civilisation is a kind of superorganic form that represents human biological corporate nature operating at its full potential. In this state the human animal is massive, very complex, and immensely powerful. It is characterised by extreme hierarchical division, and all of this structure and complexity is enabled by the creation of knowledge, which appears in a variety of forms that we study under the umbrella of ‘culture’.

When we speak of this social process as a biological process we are doing so because it is the product of our genetically evolved somatic anatomy. Immensely intelligent as we are, ‘our’ intelligence is not really ours, because we do not exist, as animals in our own right. The biological function of our incredible animal intelligence is to create order through the social combination of individuals into a unified biomass. This means we possess language in order to create a collective consciousness, and the resulting ‘social mind’, or superorganic identity, which is what collective consciousness is as an attribute of a human superorganism, is the result. And it is of the nature of this collective consciousness as an information medium of superorganic structure, that it should be ‘stupid’, because it does not exist to represent reality as it is to individuals, but to add to reality in keeping with reality as it is. Knowledge has to be fictional in order to be functional, because only in that way can it act as a medium of unity that can attract groups of individuals differentially, relative to other groups of individuals, and thereby create the hierarchical structure that is the universal pattern of structure that delivers form in the universe.

## I

### **A preliminary outline of the argument within**

A fundamental consequence of having a genuinely scientific model of human nature to work from, is that the resulting interpretation of human activity becomes neutral, discarding all bias ideas of an internal nature, serving the interests of the structural elements of superorganic being, existing in the form of living persons, you and me. The severe consequences of this loss of values, often railed against by moralists when attacking science, indicates how important bias is in the ordering of society. But again, it is only via the application of a logic emanating from the true pivot of observation that we can take this matter further by continuing to press home the idea of a functional direction to the way society develops.

The other term in our title for this alternative knowledge of existence, aside from ‘science’, is ‘atheism’, and this indicates that for us the alternative pivots are concerned with religion. Religion is the central feature of the human animal’s existence, and so it is that if we want to know what this existence is literally, in naturalistic, that is scientific terms, then our method must be the antithesis of religion, and hence it is atheistic. The conjunction of the terms to give a name to our philosophy as ‘atheist science’ is therefore appropriate on many levels of understanding, but the phrase emerged from the process of developing ideas as it

became clear that religion continued to rule our world to the extraordinary extent that we were forced to conclude that in this scientific age, science did not exist.

The nonexistence of things which palpably exist, is a jarring idea that we have been obliged to get a grip of early on, as we realised that the human animal was a superorganism and the individual did not exist. The state of nonexistence applying to things which are real and familiar on a daily basis in other words concerns the meaning given to the existence, which in turn requires us to have an idea of how words carry their meanings. The point here being one we have already alluded to without spelling it out, when we spoke of the official pivot of observation being an unspoken imperative lying behind all knowledge, as in the status of the individual as that of the human being, a false status imposed upon all meanings, *subliminally*. And that is the key to this subject of meaning carried by words, they all tend to possess a subliminal quotient of linguistic force, rather like the famous iceberg that carries seven eighths of its mass out of sight below the surface of the water it sits in.

The name Atheist Science then simply identifies the true science which arises from the true pivot of observation that has the human being as a superorganism composed of individual people. The false science is in reality Religious Science, this is the science we all know, for it is what is taught to us, and at its core is the false pivot, unspoken mark you, most of the time, that has the human animal as the person. And when we start to give actual names to the figures of false knowledge we are describing in general terms, the true extent of the conflict becomes immediately apparent, thus Darwinism is the supreme expression of false, religious science ! So we are not atheists of the official hue, we see Darwinism as the supreme enemy of atheism, acting as it does as the scientific arm of atheism as it is given to us by official sources of knowledge creation, which in turn shows that atheism does not exist in our society either ! Blimey, everything is falling apart, all the things of which our world is made, are vanishing before our eyes as we apply our alternative logic of interpretation.

And this is precisely what we should expect for here we are dealing with a material form built out of information, for which we are offering an alternative information. It appears that words are building castles in the sky, but this is incorrect. The whole point about language is that it evolved to act as the source of biological information operating at the social level of existence. Therefore the false knowledge that causes social structure to form in a particular variety of 'colours', so to speak, is performing its true functional purpose, that we have just suggested is like building castles in the sky, because these structures melt away when the ideas they derive from are exposed to a true alternative. So that 'fantasy', in human life, is a biologically functional form of information directly related to the physical existence of the living human being. Hence this real existence is based on a pattern of linguistic information that leads to our alternative pivot of observation refocusing the explanation at all points, so that we end up saying that things which exist as material entities do not actually exist, in terms of how they are understood to be according to the meaning of the ideas we have of them currently, in the world at large. And this is what leads to this whole image of alternative knowledge, the religious versus the atheistic, rooted in two true alternative physical foci of being, the false foci of individual being, versus the true foci of human biological corporate nature which reveals the human being to be a superorganism.

And so, we have atheist science acting in opposition to all knowledge currently available in society, known under the two names of religion and science. When we start giving names out here, then the shock waves induced by our previous act of naming names, as in Darwinism as nonexistent science, false science, religious science, then the shock turns to horror. And this brings us to Musolf's magnificent work, identified with the promulgation of fictitious knowledge, as in 'metaphor' ; linked to social structure, the 'nation', the central

feature of which is the phenomenon of social identity ; and the associated act of horror, as in 'holocaust', that we are going to identify with the word 'taboo'.

So that Atheist Science has brought us head to head with these central aspects of our current culture's most testing subjects, that of religion as it concerns the Jews as a political phenomenon. A most tricky subject indeed. And this is the beauty of Musolff's treatise, for it gives us a lead into the fray, that hitherto we were having to forge for ourselves, making us appear as instigators of great evil, or antisemitism, of transgressors of taboo ! What Musolff provides us with in this book is a pathway into the subject, showing that it is a subject of wide significance, not something we have manufactured in any sense whatever. And from this offering we obtain an object of knowledge fixing, that we can fix upon ourselves. By which we mean that at the core of Musolff's work is the assumption of the individual as the human being, yet the core subject is the role played by the idea that the human animal is a superorganism. Not that Musolff admits this, certainly not, but since this is precisely what we know to be the case we can bring this reality out by examining and reinterpreting his argument.

Upon first beginning Musolff's work we find that his method of dealing with Hitler's ideas, for Musolff's book is based on a reading of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, even as our present work is based upon a reading of Musolff, perfectly mimics the general approach we find ourselves making of Musolff. In other words it is as if Musolff is using modern ideas about the nature of language as developed in the institutions of authority to give a pseudo scientific understanding of Nazi history according to the false pivot of the individual, exactly as we seek to do for all human history, by using the true pivot of superorganic being. This leads to some very nice comparisons between Musolff and ourselves, that is to say between Musolff's analysis of Hitler and what Hitler was doing, and our analysis of Musolff and what he, and his academic colleagues, are doing.

The manner of presentation used below is not exactly as I would like to find being employed by others myself, but it is where I find myself to be placed in the effort of delivering this knowledge of reality via the reading of a single book. That is to say i prefer writing a book as a solid body of work presenting my ideas. But when I read any book I make notes according to the ideas and reactions prompted at the time, and I rarely return to those notes thereafter. But when I find a rare item of maximum interest to our core subject of human biological corporate nature, then I often think to do a detailed write upon based exclusively upon that book. Obviously it would be best to discern themes within any such piece of work and write chapters suitably titled on each of these themes, such as *Linguistic Force*, *Individuals as Unwitting Agents of linguistic Force*, and *Priests of Unknowable Knowledge*, might come to mind as the kind of structure I would give to a book about Musolff's work that I have already detected after reading only one chapter and a bit.

However I find such a well structured expression of my ideas along the fine lines of a professional academic piece nye on impossible to create, I usually produce solid works of my own, with the formal appearance of academic, works, though actually completely unplanned, by spinning from an initial idea, and seeing where it leads. So, in this case, I intend to use this less than perfect method that I have employed previously when basing my discussion on one specific book, which is that if rendering my notes made at the time of reading into this response, page by page. The first obvious problem here is that it rather requires that readers have a copy of the book in question, and this particular book is murderously expensive, £73 it cost me ! But this is the easiest way for me to get a reaction to this most important pieces of work for Atheist Science, perhaps most important work ever, it is so apposite to the core subject of human biological nature, in antithesis to that core subject of course. And I can

always try and add chapters bearing titles of the kind just indicated that then refer to the previous bod of notes and commentary thereon which will form the initial part of the work we are set upon producing now.

### **Social cleansing**

Starting from the initial point of inspiration that reveals that the human animal is a superorganism, we have developed a number of key ideas to give us our Atheist Science philosophy of human biological corporate nature. Fundamental to these ideas is that of Linguistic Force, a superorganic aspect of what we have determined is the life force of information that creates all living form. Living structures contain the force of life, which is expressed in the transmission and reading of information concerned in the formation of living structures, giving a fully enclosed system of existence that is self sustaining, self organising as now appears in modern scientific parlance. Human social structures are no exception to this universal rule of life, and in this context the life force is identified in a linguistic form, hence our identification of Linguistic Force.

This linguistic force is contained within the genetically evolved structures of our somatic form that gives us the anatomy of speech that we are obliged to employ in the act of living as humans. This obligatory use of speech causes social structure to arise that contains our individual selves, and as we come and go as units of superorganic being the social structure accretes over time, always on the basis of possessing individuals thereby, that accumulate over the generations and increase in numbers according to the increasing quantity of linguistic force fixed within the social structure of organic being. The fixing of linguistic force is occurs in a linguistic form, essentially as knowledge, although in its more basis form we would not recognise it as knowledge as such, but more likely identity it as cultural expression, as art and such like perhaps. So that prehistoric cave painting would be a good example of early forms of complex knowledge expressing the accretion of linguistic force within social structures. The evidence of linguistic force accretion left on cave walls from tens of thousands of years ago tells us that social structures of a very specific kind existed, thus priests owning knowledge must of existed at this time, meaning that social structure exited that was hierarchical.

Today it is interesting to see pundits operating as modern priests taking possession of this knowledge in a way that recognises the general point we have just made, except they seek to own this evidence as a support for the present ruling authority from which they derive their professional status as priests of contemporary academia. Thus a modern interpretation would tell us that this cave painting proves that society was democratic in its earliest stages because everyone will of had free access to the caves and all would of therefore partaken of the process of creating this cultural heritage. This is based on the unspoken, and false principle, that the human animal is an individual, and by giving this cultural evidence this bias interpretation the principle of the human as individual is projected by to our earliest origins. This is religious science, that we correct by saying that not only were individuals nonexistent then, but they are just as nonexistent now.

The development of the human animal via the action of linguistic force generating knowledge that forms the basis of social structure, delivers social hierarchies based upon identity that delineates elites from dependant masses. When the eventually gives rise to the civilised scale of superorganic being, we find religious identities bestriding our world as colossi. Today the world exists as one global civilisation and its identity is that of Jewishness. We name the identity of the master culture here, and in so doing we make a

major conflict with the official dogma. This instantly places in the taboo zone where the Nazis sit as supreme outsiders. And this is what brings us to the subject of the Hitler Taboo.

Linguistic force generates religion as knowledge, from which social structure comes into being in the form we know it today, as Judaism. Today we all possess a Jewish identity, but most of us would not identify ourselves as Jews. Which takes back to the idea of subliminal quotient of linguistic force being carried as covert meanings that are unspoken but present within the knowledge that is impregnated into our brains that have a linguistic empowerment existing to make us serve as units of superorganic being identified by being so impregnated with a subliminal identity.

So the picture we are painting of language projecting authority into the inter-individual space where it is fixed within social structure, that preserves said authority in the form of 'knowledge', used in the broadest possible sense as that which people 'know' about the world, or about existence, sets up a model of human society from which we can begin to develop a truly scientific, detached idea of what our social life actually is as a natural phenomenon.

In keeping with this happy prospect we have extended our ideas of how the human animal comes to take the extraordinary form it does in the world today. The Jewish religion that rules our world does so on the basis of strictly biological principles that are seen in operation throughout the living world, that is to say on the basis of living forms taking shape on the basis of complex hierarchical structural arrangements organised by the flow of information that defines living form, all united under one overarching identity, which defines each individual living form. Hence we have the current global human animal bearing the single identity of Judaism. But this all embracing identity exists in its pure form where it is known as 'Jewish' only in a tiny focused area of social structure, in all other places Jewish identity appears in other guises, and it does so on the basis of the natural state of subliminal meaning that applies to language in the spoken form.

In order for the human superorganism to grow there must be flexibility, but in order for the same living being to exist, there must also be stability. And this is seen in the course of human history that has delivered the world we know today, where there is immense stability, forever plagued by disruptive change. And the history of the Jewish identity encompasses this dualistic attribute of human life perfectly, making the tolerance of change through the preservation of changeless identity, its defining principle. Having discovered a formula for such longevity the Jewish identity was empowered to serve as the core of a civilised cultural form, and its success in this guise meant that it became a model for the extension of the superorganism it thereby became the sole identity of. And this is why, and how, the Jewish identity has given rise to a multitude of sub-Jewish identities that have transformed all humanity into Jews today, giving one global human superorganism.

What this means is that everyone is a Jew, no matter what appearance to the contrary their overt identity might suggest, even when it comes to the very antithesis of Judaism, as seen in Nazism. And so it is from this fact that we find our Atheist Science interests come to the fore in a piece of work like that which Musolff offers us in his *Metaphor, Nation and the Holocaust*, 2010. From the first moment of our understanding that the true science of humanity means recognising that the human animal is a superorganism we are bound to turn our attention to what others have said on this subject, and to wonder why no one says anything about this today. Persistence provides the answer, for we find that the first attempts at understanding humans from a scientific point of view did indeed lead directly to the truth that the human animal is indeed a superorganism, although the form of the knowledge indicating this was not so refined as we state so easily here.

Once we know that this idea once ruled the world and was understood to be the correct answer to the question of human biological nature, we are obliged to follow the course of this knowledge to see where it went. And it is this line of enquiry that leads into the turbulent waters of Nazism and antisemitism. It turns out that Nazism was created by the true science of human biological corporate nature, as seen in the school of sociological organicism. This is a point of immense interest therefore, and what we have in Musolff's work is the first ever account dealing with this subject. Except of course he does not deal with it, he only pretends to do so, for his account is informed by the false pivot of observation that regards the person as the human animal.

Because Musolff's analysis of Nazism is so focused upon the key issues concerned in a true account of Nazism based on the correct pivot of observation, we find that his argument is a remarkable likeness of our own, its key features merely being constantly distorted from a true representation of what Nazism is by the constant, unspoken, adherence to the false pivot of individuality. This leads to some quite amazing products of description, as Musolff discerns a logic in Hitler's anti-Semitic argument that employs language, as metaphor, to create social structure suited to his predetermined idea of committing genocide against the Jews, wherein we find that it is in fact Musolff who is committing the act of subversion that he attributes to Hitler ! The remarkable thing about this is that our own method of analysis is very particular to ourselves, and therefore to find an approximation of its key ideas appearing in this work that seeks to deal with the subject of human superorganicism, is, well, certainly unexpected. There is no immediately obvious reason why this coincidence of method should occur, the exact idea we have in mind here will appear when my notes are transcribed below, so I will not elaborate upon the topic now. But it was at this point that I started to have ideas about Musolff and his cohort of similarly interested academics, being a specific set of priests specialising in the subject of unknowable knowledge, which makes them guardians of the Hitler Taboo.

The impetus to become a master identity that we described when talking about the origins of Judaism above, includes other important facets of linguistic force. Not only must the master identity survive calamity, it must transform all identities into forms of itself, empowered with the exact same qualities of longevity. And this requires that the master identity is linked directly to a process of suppression, as well as creation, of knowledge. And this is why we see antisemitism as an ongoing companion of Judaism, for indeed it is vital to Judaism as a source of social cleansing that reinvigorates Judaism while erasing any targeted attacks impacting directly upon Judaism. And this is what we see happening in the rise of science that eventually comes under the control of the Nazis, from where it leads to a taboo against science, and the rebirth of Judaism, massively empowered, on the other side of the catastrophe fixing linguistic force in a powerful taboo. Thus Judaism is not simply adapted to survive social cleansing, it is evolved to instigate bouts of social cleansing to actively further its progress as the core identity of superorganic being. And this is why the world openly espouses Jewish religious identities in the form of Christianity and Islam, today. It is also why we have ceaseless warfare and relentless evil in the name of religion, personified at present by the global war of Islamic terrorism, conducted against all humanity – in the name of Judaism, we should say.

This link between the creation of Nazism in association with genuine scientific knowledge might be the reason why even a false attempt to deal with this issue results in a method that closely mimics how a true analysis would proceed, so that Musolff actually identifies the creation of false knowledge with a means of creating social structure serving the creator's political purpose, a most amazing idea to find in another from our point of view for we imagine that this key idea in our own work would be met with intense derision by any academic of any kind. But guided by the false principle of individuals as integral beings



existing in their own right, Musolff is able, without saying so, to treat Hitler as an aberration, a perverse, unnatural thing, and thus he does not mean this interpretation of how Hitler is using metaphor for covert political purposes to suggest how language operates wherever political power is the result, but of course this is exactly what we say *is* happening, which is why we discern in Musolff, exactly what he discerns, in Hitler.

### **Small consolation**

Given the history humanity has endured, and continues to endure without letup, despite the modern age we now live in that we are entitled to think denotes a significant break with the past, with miseries exemplified by word war and Nazi nightmare, a work such as Musolff's clearly reveals the need for any true science of humanity to be banished from existence. The entire thrust of Musolff's method is to isolate Nazism from mainstream history, which requires that he can detach Hitler from the stable phase that war intruded into.

Whereas we introduce a scientific model that has a necessarily unifying effect upon any inconsistencies by bringing under one uniform model of explanation. This is the crux of the matter taken at face value, in keeping with the false, superficial perspective that seeks to keep everything disjointed, thereby allowing power to decouple itself from the nastiest features lying behind it, while allowing it to emphasise the nice features of social dynamics that are connected with power. At a deeper level of understanding these contrasting features of superorganic being are seen to be part of a unified process, and the reason for the style of explanation seen in Musolff, relying upon the fabrication of false knowledge, is then accounted for as part of the uniform process, so that we reach passed the superficial idea that the real nature of history must be hidden, as indeed it must, but for why ? We explain why by providing an all encompassing model of human biological corporate nature.

And at its root lies religion, as in Jewish mythology of One universal God, and a dualistic dynamic of good and evil, all circumscribed by the curious fact of our own individual existence. Thus all knowledge is made in the image of Judaism, as set out in the Bible, which is why the New Testament was written as an extension of the Old Testament material, to create a subidentity of Judaism from which to grow a global Jewish superorganism.

Seen in this light, we can but be awestruck by the power of intuitive reasoning that is represented in Jewish mythology, and by the result of its creation, as in the social structure of a world being. So the bedrock of our Atheist Science is not a malign hatred of religion, or Judaism, ours is not an anti-Semitic creed of any kind. Because religion is part of reality, as opposed to be what the priests say it is, as in an attempt at understanding reality, then human knowledge that explains religion as something real and natural, because it comes from within the organism that religion exists to create according to a biological process, then religion must be destroyed by science, there is no avoiding this, unless a false science such as Darwinism is produced that is covertly rooted in the bias principles of linguistic meaning that form the basis of Jewish mythology, as in the assumption that the individual is the human animal. But while science given free reign does change everything as *we know it*, it cannot truly change anything as it is. And this is where the relevance of our alarming history ought to enter our minds. For what our genuine science of human biological nature reveals is that war and terror are vital to our health and wellbeing, as long as we live under the dominion of religion. Therefore, we have a basis upon which to seek another way of life, without religion. Except no such way exists, and this is why we speak of the priests of false knowledge as the priests of unknowable knowledge, for it is their job to ensure that falsity is preserved while

truth is suppressed, so that we can continue to live with that that we cannot live without, by living the lie of a split personality to existence, known as 'good' and 'evil', that we are forever being tested by. This is the most advanced model of existence ever to come into existence, it is called Judaism, and it rules our world. We can know this, since I am revealing this, but then again we cannot know it, because we cannot devise a more advanced model of existence, because the genetic evolution of our somatic form is evolved to operate under the influence of linguistic programming, and we simply cannot escape the unifying imperative that obliges any successful programme to reduce us to the status of automatons. The impasse lies in our individual anatomy, that has been evolved to make us units of superorganic being. We are, in other words, as insects, like ants, these are our closest cousins in nature, sharing an affinity with us that is based on a common nature, as opposed to the ludicrous comparison foisted upon under the name of Darwin, that would have us think apes our closest kin because they have a common ancestry. This crude, pathetic deception, shows just how nasty the perversion of modern knowledge really is.

And of course when people do pretend we share a common fate with the ants, they take the idea to absurd lengths, exactly as we see enacted in Hitler monstrous extension of the genuine scientific insight into the Jews as the foci of master identity to which we are all attached. This mechanism of exaggeration is a key feature of the priesthood defending the master identity. If the truth emerges, then instead of delivering it in moderation, it is picked up by a miscreant, of whom there are many millions performing the task of subverting knowledge, and made into something monstrous, in order to prevent simple reason from ruling our world. This is why we are such a mess, the wonder is how we manage to be so organised at the same time. But whatever mysteries they are, they are all of a natural kind, and as such they are susceptible of precise scientific explanation, were science allowed to exist in our world.

### **Secular servitude**

Since we mentioned the impossibility of having a world without religion just now I thought I would insert a comment on something in the news this Easter. Our prime minister, David Cameron, has been beating the drum for Christianity this religious season and he made a comment about Jesus inventing the 'big society', which is his newspeak terminology for handing over the taxes paid to the state to religious organisations acting under the cover of public service organisations. I recently applied for a job as a cleaner with a charity in town and their form asked if I would be OK working in a Christian setting, to which I said yes, but their in depth, personal form, asked questions about values which indicated I was an atheist, I heard nothing from them, even though I am working as a cleaner and I have experience as a social worker. This is the true nature of government funds going to overtly religious, yet secular institutions, it is a backdoor method of making the absolute theocracy we live in, a real theocracy, as it has always been, bar a couple of centuries of recent history.

Anyway Cameron's call for us to be proud of our Christian identity prompted a letter signed by fifty secularists, published in *The Telegraph*, accusing him of causing division in society ! And therein we see how the atheists lend their support to religion, for here they are saying we should be embracing all religions !! Too much.

These atheists have no alternative vision and no real idea of what atheism is as a view of existence, a philosophy of life to live by. Consequently they accept the same deal that everyone else living under Judaism does.

---

Tuesday, 22 April 2014 – Yesterday I reached the end of chapter two, and hit a patch of material that prompts me to call this the most corrupt, dishonest book I have ever come across. This book consists of one grand bare faced lie, seen in the denial of continuity in Nazism. Speaking of the influences acting upon Hitler Musolff says :

even if these details were fully known, they would still only represent the material “input” into Hitler’s ideology : the system in which they appear in *Mein Kampf* cannot be derived or predicated from them  
(Musolff, p. 22)

Arguments such as these have the special mechanism of logic that we might call ‘detachment’, whereby items of interest are able to be decoupled from the continuity of human existence. This attribute is fundamental to Darwinism, as we often note, where the core idea of natural selection quite obviously cannot be applied to humans as we exist on a daily basis, as long as we are assumed to be individuals existing in our right. In this way biological science was manufactured in such a way as to exclude humans from its reach, and this is why Darwinism has been made into the greatest science of all time, because it is not science, at all.

But here, in this example by Musolff, we discern the exact same mechanism of false logic being applied in a narrower sense, to Hitler. And meanwhile this kind of bias logic is what Musolff is at such pains to describe as informing Hitler’s deranged hatred of the Jews, in which Musolff is probably correct, but from which he is not free, and indeed from our point of view Hitler and Musolff are part of one and the same team.

But what makes this act of excision so egregious to us is the astounding exclusion of a massive swathe of history that is of central importance to the argument Musolff is presenting, but which he pretends does not exist, by which mean sociological organism, denoted by the term ‘social organism’. The removal of sociological organicism from history is seen by Atheist Science, to be the very *reason* that the First World War was fired up, seen as an act of social cleansing, which is all that it was in reality. So the removal of this fabulous period of true science was a major action performed by our world, but it is astounding to see a modern academic pretending that this history did not exist even as he sets about examining exactly this topic at that time, which can only constitute an further act in the erasure of this most glorious history from all public knowledge. This is why I find Musolff so incredibly nasty.

And just now I have followed up a reference in Musolff that has relieved me of another pain in the brain caused by this man. I noted when reading him yesterday how his jargon laden gobbledegook was mind numbing. This concerned the most bizarre terminology being applied to the interpretation of Hitler’s ideas. But I have just ordered a book called *The Way We Think : Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities*, by Fauconnier and Turner, 2002, wherein we discover the source of this mode of garbage reasoning. Using the ‘look inside’ facility on Amazon I see that these intellectual delinquents promulgate a sophisticated form of religious science wherein the individual as robot is treated as a sacred being of individuality, that is to say they explain the evolution of language ! Yeah, right. That’ll be the day. Until this book arrives from America in a months time I will not really be able to say anything about their argument, but it is of course the usual crap borne of the false pivot of individuality, and can be nothing but crap as long as it is thus falsely informed. Still, at least this allows us to make sense of what otherwise was looking totally deranged on Musolff’s part, which in turn shows us how all members of academia form a unified body of individuals working tirelessly to control knowledge toward one false aim of supporting the

master identity of Judaism. Hitler of course was doing exactly the same thing, laying the foundation for the future priestcraft of men like Musolf, as Darwin laid the foundations for future generations of priests, men like Dawkins, and Hitler of course, to do the exact same job, that of preserving the message of corporate being which has the Jewish identity at its core. None of these people know this of course, and it looks as if this last named title is all about this fact, only not about it at all, because it is informed by the false pivot of individuality, which is all that is required to ensure that any idea will only produce ideas in conformity to the message of Jewish identity. Knowledge control, and hence social power, and who will be the master race, is all about pivots of observation and interpretation.

### **Good and evil**

Good and evil are perhaps the most basic of decoupling mechanisms, separating God the all powerful from any responsibility for unpleasantness in life, and leading thereby to one of the most renowned conflicts of understanding in Christian ideology. The idea of good and evil is an easy one for us all to relate to, but the distinction it derives from religion whereby evil is supposed to exist as a force within the universe, is commonplace. With the immense evil in our world this may not be so surprising, but nonetheless the human animal is a superorganism and this grand mechanism of understand, or misunderstanding, is merely a means of delivering social structure according to a set pattern. But it appears that the decoupling mechanism is the most basic of units of logical organisation allowing linguistic force to generate a programme that brings the human animal into existence by organising our individual behaviour.

### **Denying the right to ignorance**

I suppose we might call this denying the right to believe. With the development of strident atheism in recent times, exemplified by Dawkins, and others they call the 'new atheists', none of whom are real atheists at all from our Atheist Science point of view, the religious lobby have taken to describing this type of vociferous atheism according to the same terms that had come into common usage to describe the hard-line religious lobby, that is most typically associated with America.

It is the case that if one group claim one thing that is the exact opposite of what another claims that relative to one another what they claim is 'fascistic', it cannot be otherwise, because the one is an absolute denial of the other. This is where the modern ploy of multiculturalism has come to the fore as the tool of fascist Judaism, whereby the absolute rule of Judaism is defended by having a myriad of sub-Judaic slave identities added to the mix, while obviously maintaining the defence that each is independent, on the basis that the individual is the integral unit of human existence. And as we have just seen this '50' secularists have lent their weight to Judaism by making Cameron's claim of Christian identity for Britain a divisive act. But a true atheism is not an alternative point of view requiring and granting tolerance. A true atheism is a positive assertion of reality, essentially synonymous with science, and as such any defenders of atheism should not tolerate anything that smacks of tolerating ignorance. And this is the sole basis upon which atheism can proclaim a basis for a unifying social authority akin to that which religion delivers ; not that I particularly like talking about such an organisation, but it is what our science says must be if atheism is to exist, as we just indicated above when saying atheism did not have the means to replace religion, because it had no unifying ideology.

Today, Thursday, 24 April 2014, at work I had an exchange with a young woman I work with which prompted this thought that the sole basis for an atheist authority had to be a denial of the right to ignorance. The reason being that if we allow ignorance freedom to exist, then we undermine the ability of ourselves to be free to know the truth. Again, the explanation for this interdependence is the same as usual, namely that we do not exist as individuals, and what one believes, all must believe. And that is precisely the situation we find ourselves under Judaism.

My young colleague lost her mother a year ago due to alcoholism, and it is an emotional topic, quite naturally, so I was my usual insensitive self I suppose when I said that there was no life after death. She responded by saying that was an amazing assumption, to which I replied that it was a daft idea that would never occur to her if it had not been implanted in her brain. But this subject goes back to the debates I had with my father when I was a teenager, like this woman, and he used to say atheism was denying comfort to old ladies in need of some consolation in their old age. All we can say is that there is certainly a need for compassion when dealing directly with individuals, but that when atheists are promulgating their ideas, they should have a set of principles that serve the purpose, and central amongst them must be a denial of the right to ignorance that these situations in effect demand on emotional grounds.

Friday, 25 April 2014 – At work today, it occurred to me, that our miserable slave existences courtesy of Jewish master race identity, reduce us to the state of domesticated imbecility to such a degree, that like domesticated livestock transformed by the information programme shaping their domesticated form, we need the deceptions we live by. Imagine how it would be living in a world where we did not imagine that there was something to come after this ! If I could get my young colleague to feel that her mother's miserable life was all it appeared to be, and hers would be little better, then how miserable would she feel with her lowly lot ? And times that by tens of millions, for England alone, and how would our slave existence persistence under the pressure of such a collective depression ? I heard some figures for suicides under thirty recently, we have the highest rate in Europe I seem to recall, but the figures escape me. But this is what these slave ideologies are for, they are programmes that organise individuals into forming a human animal, for the human animal, not for us. Although indeed we do need to be catered to, as in managed, not for our sake, but for the superorganisms sake, which translates into the sake of the master elite, the Jews, and each elite segment of each sub-Judaic identity making up the body. Interestingly a new sub-Judaic identity was formerly recognised yesterday, that of the Cornish ! What a joke. and in a few months time the Scots will have a chance of creating a new identity elite exploiting the dynamics of Jewish master race identity that form the corporate being produced by human biological corporate nature.

I decided to search for this letter yesterday and easily located a copy, via *Christian Society Today*, which had an article discussing it. The whole package proved to be a pathetic as I had already took it to be, but a little more detail does no harm. There was not much to the letter. The list of fifty names began with a Muslim, which gave it a religious identity, suggesting it was a backdoor way for Islam to object to Cameron's bias. In *Christian Society Today* one of the signatories was quoted thus, in response to a group of religious philosophers who called for atheist to chill-out and accept the status quo as perfectly fair to all :

The British Humanist Association, which was among the signatories of the secularist letter, suggested the letter from the philosophers has missed their point.

Andrew Copson, chief executive of the BHA, said in *The Telegraph* : “That letter made it clear that we respect the right of people to their religious beliefs but that in a very diverse society like today’s we need to build an inclusive national identity not a narrow one. To try and make this instead a war of words about religion as such is a distraction.”

(*Christian Society Today*, Thursday, 24 April 2014.)

So this leader of the leading atheist institution in our absolute theocracy is clearly a stalwart defender of religion, while being oblivious to any true idea of what atheism is, and must be as an idea of worth in itself. Copson, instead of saying atheists deny the right of anyone to tout ignorance, on the contrary, respects this right above the atheist’s right to possess true knowledge. For clearly if people have a right to be religious they must teach religion, and this means science cannot exist, otherwise all that we say in Atheist Science would be simply ‘science’.

---

Wednesday, 23 April 2014 – Just a note to record the influx of books prompted by Musolff, today I received *Illness as Metaphor* by Susan Sontag, 1978, a slim volume of no great consequence, but certainly very much to the point of Musolff’s argument, having to do with the use of harm done by disease to invoke an image of the harm done by cultural forms such as Jews, and elites of all kinds of course, which always come in for this kind of verbal exaggeration, as they always talk up their *wonderful* values in their own verbal output.

Also *The Book of the Body Politic* by Christine de Pizan, 1994, first published in 1406, in French. This is a curiosity, cheap enough to buy. It is new to me, but is based upon other ideas that I have heard of in connection with sociological organicism, such as Plato and Salisbury. The most important immediate thing to strike one upon looking at this book is how it is divided into three parts, representing a social hierarchy, which this book is all about the delineation of, by way of appropriate teaching, or *programming*, as we scientists would say. The importance of this triadic structure befitting a human social model is bound to be missed by the likes of Musolff because his ideas are essentially mystical, being based on the individual as the natural form of the human being. But for scientists aware that the human animal is a superorganism composed of individuals arranged in a triadic macro hierarchy the appearance of this order is of note, and it is seen in many other such philosophical treatise on the ordering of society, as well as in religious forms, such as that of Judaism, as in Jew (master identity), Christian (executive order), and Muslim (social biomass).

It is a curious thing to see how keen everyone is to treat humans as if they are robots that must be programmed, while at the same time such people deplore the least suggestion that humans are anything other than free agents ! Nothing could demonstrate more how utterly abject is our state of robotic abjectness, we are so determined that at any cost, we will not allow ourselves to be set free, to know the truth. For we know this must destroy us, destroy our wellbeing, *because we are natural born robots !!*

Friday, 25 April 2014 – Yesterday I searched for ‘body politic’ on the Internet Archive, and amongst a collection of gay material I spotted a nineteenth century book called *The Body Politic*, by an American, William Barnes, 1866. As luck would have it I dropped on an original copy for a nice price of £37, in America, and snapped it up. This book does not use the organicist phrase ‘social organism’, and as such it is a nice example of the use of the idea of a body politic during the nineteenth century. It does appear that this author has the figure of the nation before his mind’s eye, to be represented in comparison to the person, which is a modern form of the Hobbesian view that took the monarch as the equivalent of the state in

Barnes' work. But the fact remains that the exception, which Barnes work is, proves the rule. This work is definitely not in the mainstream of the ideas that led directly to Hitler's philosophy of power. This mainstream was to be found in a very serious academic, intellectual form, essentially constituting a science of sociology, a true science of sociology which has been supplanted by a modern, pseudo sociology crafted by the absolute Jewish theocracy that is served by all extant institutions.

Monday, 28 April 2014 – Using Musolff's bibliography, and from reading his text, I took PDF copies of books by Hans Günther, noted as someone that Hitler might of drawn on for some of his ideas on racial matters. Examining Günther's *The Racial Elements of European History*, 1926, just to try and spot anything of interest while filing it, pages 263-4, right at the close, give us something. Here we find a classic Hitlerian evocation of the sociologically organicist derived principle of the non existence of the individual, who can only be thought of as a unit of collective being. This important snippet is imbedded within a thoroughly racial argument of the nature of the collective, wherein the Jewish political unit of nationality is the critical feature of the superorganism unwittingly alluded to in this moronic subversion of science. By 'Jewish political unit' we have in mind the fact that the nation is the building block of the global superorganism generated by Jewish identity programming, this form of social organisation being what Jewish identity proper has always been adapted to. I do not see how this view of the individual in relation to the social order can be related to the body politic model, which is not about denying individuality in the person, on the contrary, it is about projecting individual personal being onto the social collective. It is only the nineteenth century, scientific idea of the social organism, that leads to this complete transference of being from the person to the social entity, and this is the true scientific model which this idiotic racial bullshit ruined, thus enabling Judaism to continue to be the bane of humanity. On Sunday's Big Questions on BBC 1 the question under discussion when I switched on was Is Islam the greatest threat to the modern world ? Or words close to that. And this is Judaism, plaguing us still, all thanks to Adolf Hitler delivering the latest version of the Jew's anti-Semitic defence mechanism, which Musolff is charging up in the book we have in hand.

### **What does 'metaphor' really mean ?**

I am driven towards asking this question by Musolff leading me to it. We obviously have a clear focus on this topic indicated in Musolff's title, but his references to other works indicate the wide interest in this topic, such as *The Body Politic : Corporeal Metaphor in Revolutionary France, 1770-1800*, by Antoine de Baecque, 1993, that just came through my door this afternoon, Tuesday, 29 April 2014, which likewise indicates a clear view of 'metaphor' as something distinct and deserving of special treatment, as if it were somehow different from other modes of thinking or speaking. And this is where I am stumped to get in gear with this idea. In the first place I obviously do not have any conception of the metaphor as anything other than a true idea, so what is all the fuss about ? If we described the earth as a 'ball' would we be expounding a metaphor ? No, not at all, we would be speaking truly, if also by way of comparison with a familiar object denoting a shape. This notwithstanding that the earth, more technically, is not a ball, but a geoid. Consequently I have been seeking to find some way of broaching this question of what a metaphor is, and I seem to be ready to have a go.

The first point I would raise is that according to my understanding of how language evolves, it does so by building words from base units of meaning. Without a text on this before me I am short of examples, but hieroglyphics work in some such way, by making

words from combinations of symbols that may give new meanings by combining two familiar ones. Ah, some time ago I noted an interesting example of a discovery being made concerning the location of the hanging gardens Babylon, by discerning the meaning of a word that had hitherto been missed. The new understanding indicated that an Archimedes screw was lifting water, denoted by the name of a tree with a twisted stem, which gave a clue to a new whereabouts for this ancient wonder. So here we have a metaphorical method used to provide a name for a new object. This new name is not then a metaphor ! It is not a metaphor because it names a *real* object, newly discovered, or, as in the case of the ‘body politic’, intuitively discerned, but not really perceived, or certainly not for what it actually is. So, given that we know that the human animal *is* a superorganism, then describing the social form that we call ‘society’, and know in political terms as such, is not a metaphor either. *Except*, in so far as it is used disingenuously ! And thus the true meaning of a metaphor is ‘the promulgation of false knowledge’, which is exactly how the likes of Musolff treat it !! His attitude is that this ‘politic body’ is a pure fiction, and it is this fact that makes the allusion to a living entity a metaphor, so that this dismissal is a highly contorted example of the self-fulfilling prophecy being built into the meaning of a word. This shows us just how clever and how powerful the use of words can be to twist our minds into thinking whatever the priesthood controlling language want us to think, which is of course how the Bible came to be written, and was then able to enslave the world to Judaism by being extended, first into the New Testament, and then into the Koran. The whole idea of society is a linguistic extension of this method giving us the political language that gives us our metal conception of existence in society, as humans, and the word ‘metaphor’ is merely one more example of the unit of linguistic force employed to provide us with this entirely false image of existence, that we destroy by providing a true science of human biological nature, that Darwinism was conjured up to circumvent. All of which reasoning, indicates how it was possible for something so amazing as subverting science by creating a false science was possible by creating Darwinism, for this is how language works, and how language evolved. And put like this, we can begin to grasp just how difficult it is for us to see past this mental vision of linguistic form, that is quite simply an illusion, *dressing* something very real.

As for ourselves, as scientists of human nature, the metaphor is simply language, and nothing more. The idea of a metaphor is merely another example of words being conjured up to create things that do not exist, like ‘God’, ‘evil’, ‘heaven’, and so on ad infinitum. The only question *we* are faced with in these cases, is to discover the true object that the concocted word refers to, as with ‘God’, which refers to the ‘human superorganism’, or ‘evil’, which refers to the dynamics of superorganic physiology that are vital to health, such as social cleansing, such as holocausts, but understood, according to the master identity’s slave making programme, as ‘evil’, for the purpose of making a programme that can animate the units of superorganic being, as in people.

I am keen to see if I can discover any clues as to the origin of the phrase ‘social organism’ in Baecque’s book, this would be exactly the time and place where I would expect it to come from, as it first occurs in Comte during the 1830s, and its roots can be found in his intellectual forbear, St. Simon.

### **The analogical method**

There is an important historical comparison to be made between this modern academic ruse of framing genuinely scientific reasoning occurring at a prescientific level of



expression as a 'metaphor', as we described the likes of Musolff doing above. And this is to be found in the exact same strategy adopted by the ruling intellectual elite during the nineteenth century, in response to the exact same phenomenon, expressed as sociological organicism, focused upon the idea of society as a 'social organism'. The words 'metaphor' and 'analogy' are essentially interchangeable in this context, as is the general idea coming under attack, that of the 'body politic' versus the 'social organism'. I suppose my own idea would be that the more modern term 'metaphor' denotes something a bit more extensive than the older, more simple word 'analogy', but in terms of the mechanics of message production via knowledge control based on the control of language, of linguistic meaning that is, the situation today can be seen to be identical with that which the priests were contending within in the nineteenth century, where the exact same truth had to be suppressed then, as now, and this must remain the case forever more, for truth is eternal, and as long as it is suppressed the pressure for its release will be ever-present, because the mode of suppression will always leave a gaping void in knowledge that some will be bound to question, not least because the method of control actually requires the maintenance of a state of official ignorance, or mystery, that requires endless punters to seek to try and resolve, while all the while they are really just earning their place in the superorganism by maintaining the message of Jewish identity by churning out false knowledge.

### ***The Social Organism***

Monday, 05 May 2014 – Well, would you believe it, I finally got around to filing away a document taken from the net a few weeks ago, mentioned by Musolff, that I was delighted to find was available online, and the title is *Do Metaphors Evolve ? The Case of the Social Organism* by Nico Mouton, 2013, not sure of the date, taken this from the PDF details. Mouton proceeds to discuss the idea of the social organism exactly as we are interested in it, focusing upon the nineteenth century and all the sociological organicists of this era who were not the least interested in the idea of a body politic, and were the entire, and exclusive source of Hitler's sociological organicism. Clearly we can now say that Musolff was fully aware of this material, yet he chooses to completely ignore it when writing about, preferring instead to pretend that the subject is the crass, nonscientific idea of the body politic, that is the social body as a grand person. This wilful bias reminds me of the only book I have ever found on this subject, written by an American, an amateur, in the aftermath of the instigation of sociobiology by Wilson, this book is *The Social Organism : A Short History of the Idea that a Human Society may be regarded as a Gigantic Living Creature*, Maclay, 1990. This book, as wonderful as I thought it was when I bought it over a decade ago, likewise kept to a narrow field of discussion, mostly concerning itself with the likes of Comte, and Spencer probably, without looking. Maclay also provided evidence that he knew all about the real organicists like Lilienfeld, but these important people he too, like Musolff, declined to concern himself with, only Musolff does not even bother to mention this avoidance in his own work, which is why we need to note the evidence of his awareness and avoidance by way of his references. Meanwhile he pretended he was a great fan of this idea, which he clearly was not.

Friday, 09 May 2014 – Nick Griffin of the British National Party was interviewed on the dinnertime *Daily Politics*, BBC 2, today, and he said the English Defence League was a Zionist front organisation. This drew the response from Andrew Neil that saying that anything was a Zionist front, was anti-Semitic ! The first point of interest about this remark

is that it acknowledges the basic principle of people acting as antisemites to protect the Jews from legitimate hatred of their Jewish cause. We of course would say that the BNP was a Jewish front, and the reason is very much what makes us see Nazi ideology as a Hitler Taboo. The crucial difference, as ever, is that we shift to an entirely different pivot of observation, and hence interpretation, that denies the existence of individuals, whereas what Griffin means is that the EDL is actively rooted in Jewish origins. This of course would be a conspiracy, for the leading members would be aware of this, and this would make it a front for the Jews.

However, as ever, by denying the existence of individuals, and saying that the human animal is a superorganism created by a linguistic identity programme, we circumvent all such political, divisive terminology, and unify everything under one uniform process of human corporate nature.

They seem to of been having a bit of philosophy day, I think they were discussing Kropotkin, for some reason, I missed the main part of this section, but he wrote a book called *Mutual Aid*, my digital copy is dated 1914, which places it at the very end of the period of free science, regarding sociology. But the young left wing socialist pundit was saying that his ideas were very appealing, as he thought that humans were social animals that were made to live socially, and therefore to aid one another in society. This model was too fanciful for these sorry times, but it was a goal to hope for, he said. Well of course it is the same old shit, these dimwits stick like limpets to the political model that the linguistic identity programme runs in their brain to create the living superorganism. As we always point out, everything is always perfect, and cannot be otherwise, therefore our sorry state is due to the fact that nature has evolved us as social animals, but unfortunately nature did not have the means, or *desire*, to create us according to a moral ideal befitting that which we individuals are bound to crave. Nature made us social by fashioning us exactly as she did other superorganisms, like ants, so that we are robots that act in accordance with a linguistic programme, and this is why we are highly social, yet riven with the most evil and antisocial behaviours, according to the false logic that we are programmed to think with. As ever these fuckers just will not apply science to humans, they are priests, delivering the programme, from a myriad of directions, socialism, fascism, intellectualism, religion, all of which are the same. This secret of social power is stated by the great twentieth century philosopher of power, Adolf Hitler, in his *Mein Kampf*, where he tells us that there can only be one message, it can appear in a myriad of forms, but it can only ever be one message. Unfortunately, Hitler being what he was, just another stooge priest of Judaism, he does not explain this, so we need to actually know how this is so in order to appreciate that major significance of this statement, but we may rest assured that Hitler knew perfectly well that the nature of this 'one message' dictum was derived directly from the reality of sociological organicism, that denied the existence of the individual and made the collective being the sole real being. This we may suppose, is the true basis of his political power as a leader, in so far as his ideas drew upon the idea of the social organism propounded in his day.

And since we have been directed toward the roots of a fascist organisation in modern Britain, fascist and anti-Semitic, in appearance, yet Jewish in origin, according to Griffin, we might note that Hitler did not make himself, he was selected by the military intelligence of post world war one Germany and trained to be the leader he became. Quite what we can take from that as a Jewish point of origin is it impossible for me to say directly, but it is clear to me that in Germany then, as now, indeed in everywhere, always, the core of authority that has the will to operate as a secret police force, always supports the roots of Judaism, although it may do so in the guise of Christianity and Islam. These facts as drawn from reading *Mein Kampf*.

Also today, drawing on a reference in Mouton for an essay I downloaded last week, I ordered volume 37 of the *American Anthropologist* journal for 1935, it was a complete volume at the nice price of £16. Something I have discussed often over the years is the fact that no one deals with the idea of the social organism, because the idea is to bury this genuine science and only to let modern fake sociology exist out in the open. As a consequence I have never found a meaningful denunciation of the idea that society is an organic entity. The usual practice is to deal tersely with the subject while referring readers to some prior, thorough, examination and denunciation, which proves to be equally vacuous when examined. I have now read this short essay *On the Concept of Function in Social Science* by Radcliffe-Brown, 1935, but it is another rare example of an essay that deals with the idea that society is a biological entity. Needless to say it is terse, and negative, but nonetheless, it is perhaps the best such treatment I have seen, though it is a number of years since I considered such material and I have no recollection of any contents, I just know that all have proved most disappointing. Unfortunately the PDF did not have an associated text copy and I was going to select a section where he cuts to the chase and makes the distinction between an 'animal organism' and a social organism. Page 396 to 397 is the section of interest, and here he uses fancy scientific talk to pretend that the social body is fundamentally different from the 'animal body'. But, of course, as ever, this nonsense is only *correct* from the *false point of view* which has it that *the individual is the human animal* ! Which then of course makes all conclusions self fulfilling prophecy emanations of the bias stupidity. Clearly, if you want to treat the human social form as a natural entity then you need to adopt the kind of radical approach that we do in Atheist Science, where we deny the individual is an animal in their own right and instead declare the social body to be the human animal. Although this man was pretending to be acting as a scientist of human nature, this method of knowledge control is exactly that which we see practiced in more facile and obvious ways in the likes of philosophy, that is to say you make an assumption and then declare that whatever science might suggest in materialistic terms, is false because that would make that assumption invalid ! We noted an example of this from the *Big Questions* debate last Sunday when a woman said that individuals knew people loved them as a conviction which science could not penetrate, therefore science could not access the human domain !! But of course once we have a true scientific model before us this all becomes so much idiocy, since all aspects of human life become subject to scientific examination since we then know that the individual does not exist, only the human animal composed of individuals has an all embracing existence, which explains any, and all, individual actions of whatever kind, and cannot fail to do so.

So this item from Radcliffe-Brown is all the same as anything else, it uses the false pivot of knowledge creation, inevitably so, but as with Musolff himself, we must still delight in finding a piece like this, since such corrupt pieces are all we are ever going to get, but they do at least provide an acknowledgement of this perennial problem of trying to keep genuine science suppressed, and that after all is what Musolff's book is all about, extending the Hitler Taboo without which it would have been impossible to prevent this genuine science of human corporate nature from emerging, and thus destroying Judaism, and our whole world. The Nazis were a miniscule price to pay for the reward they have conferred upon *us*.

The other point about buying this collected volume is that in the past I have found that these journals are in the habit of dealing with subjects from edition to edition, and with a bit of luck there may be more or less interest in the annual volume. Thus in volume nineteen for the year 1917 we find a major essay by a leading anthropologist pretending to be friendly to sociological organicism, but in reality acting as an enemy, *The Superorganic* by Kroeber, which then draws criticism from people who directly denounce this man's treatment of the

superorganic at all, as in *Do We Need a "Superorganic"* ? by Sapir, and *The Autonomy of the Social* by Goldenweiser. And this is the pattern we seen down the generations of 'academics' dealing with humans ever since science became an unstoppable force and Darwinism was created to act as the backstop to ensure real science could never exist because the void a suppressed science would have to occupy was filled by Darwinism ! This constant manipulation of knowledge, to always ensure that science cannot exist, so that religion can survive, ready to re-emerge, is the secret of our world. And that is what our owners have brought Muslims into our land to achieve—thanks to *Hitler's* self destructive European war—as Griffin himself indicated today when he spoke of the steady Islamification of our culture. But naturally, as with Hitler, his being the only voice for such contentious scientific truths, only helps the Jews, the priests, our masters ! Griffin is of course a devout Christian ! So this explains why this expression of the Jewish slave identity should exist, and that was exactly the same impetus that created Hitler's antisemitism in such a ludicrous form, but one solidly based on real ideas, that Musolff is dead set on disguising in this work, not consciously, he merely follows the programme running in his brain, and can do no other.

### **Human termite mentality**

We often speak of the 'programme', or the 'message', this is the linguistic equivalent of the genetic 'programme' called a genome, which is the programme delivering the total living form. And when it comes to individuals being 'stupid' by supporting nonsensical ideas such those concerned with the supernatural, we speak of idiocy of these clever people being all about the programme running in their brains, which animates them according to the organisational requirements of the living being they are part of. Thus when I communicated with someone on a free speech discussion site last year and they defended the idea of the supernatural, causing me to finally address them in terms such as those set out just now, we might liken this model to that of the termite adding grains of mud to the walls encasing the termite superorganism.

Does the termite know what it is doing when it performs its duties ? Hardly, it consciousness is circumscribed to local conditions related to its genetic programme. Likewise did my interlocutor know what he was doing when idiotically defending the idea of the supernatural as a perfectly plausible idea of reality ? Absolutely not, even though I was straining myself to inform him of this ! He was stubbornly working on the principle of his individuality, and mine, which made anything he said as potentially valid as anything I said, no matter what was being said! He had a mental programme running in his brain that made him do this, as surely as the termite that repairs a damaged termite mound, and for the exact same purpose, that of securing the social integrity of the structure these elementary creatures, human and termite, live within.

Monday, 26 May 2014 – In keeping with a longstanding habit of inserting comments drawn from life I want to record a conversation I had in the pub on Saturday. I said to a young man who I know from the bar that religion was terrorism, for some reason I do not recall, and this drew an immediate, terse rejection. He said his parents were Christians, and though he did not particularly favour religion he would not hear it described that way. But the point of interest occurred when he said that his father was a scientist. I said that it was not possible for a scientist to be religious, which drew the inevitable reply that the evidence of his father contradicted this statement. I of course rejected this simplistic idea, and set of on an explanation that there was no science in our society, and as such the real lesson of this

apparent contradiction was that his father was not a scientist ! The beauty of this little exchange is the way that the reality of his father's *social* status actually showed how linguistic force creates structure that in turn creates reality, to all appearances. And who can blame anyone for falling under the spell of such linguistic influences becoming fixed in massive social structures that we are then immersed in in every possible sense of the word immersed ? *This* is how linguistic force really works. How could this young man think about the situation in any other way than he did. I said to him at one point in our exchange that everyone says what he was saying to me, that if I spoke to a million people I would get the exact same response from every one of them. He said that should tell me something. As if majority equates to truth, but of course what majority does is constitute authority, which equals truth to most people. Obviously he was just a normal Mr Plod, but everyone is, I have never met anyone who was not, or seen signs of any such people existing, anywhere, ever. I am alone in desiring truth, real knowledge. Hence I see the truth that it is impossible to pass to others, although I love to hate society and to criticise, which again obviously runs against the grain of how most people live in conformity in society. I suppose he thinks he is a radical thinker, he told me some time back that he is bisexual, and said I suppose you think that makes me greedy, no I told him. Such a thought would never enter my head, I do not think about sex in such judgmental terms, some stuff I don't like, but not on judgmental grounds.

So the point is that this tiny example of how a simple fact of our world makes us see reality in a complete way, provides us with a minute clue to the whole edifice of superorganic being that is the constant argument we rattle off all the time. In order for this youth to say that you can be religious and religious, proven by his father being a Christian and a scientist, a whole edifice of social structure must exist. And this is where we begin with Darwinism as a foundation for a false structure within which a man can be a professional scientist and believe in God, even though any idiot can see immediately that the idea of science must preclude any possibility of an alternative explanation of any aspect of existence such as religion. But the whole religious edifice today is built upon exploiting this idiocy, certainly, but it is when we hit a neat example of this in action in life that we see the whole dynamic of linguistic force as it really is. And in addition, this is where Hitler and his taboo comes in too, in exactly the same way. Hitler's antisemitism is simply a foundation stone akin to that of Darwin's, befitting the modern scientific era, and setting a new structure in place to protect the core identity of Judaism, and, as I finish the last chapter this afternoon, leaving only the conclusion, I can say we will discover the whole drift of Musolf's book is a continuation of this expression of linguistic force delivering the exact same outcome, the augmentation of the superorganic structure, minute piece by minute piece, building on the initial superstructure put in place by Darwin and Hitler. This adding of particles of false knowledge to the termite mound of human being, is done automatically in precisely the way that the young man performed this exact action by rebuffing me in obedience to the certain knowledge he had, such as that religion was perfectly valid in this world, proven by his own father's status as a scientist ! Isn't it marvellous, how nature works ? This is the mammalian termite in action.

Why do we use our incredible intelligence to be stupid ? Because we do not exist. Hence our intelligence has the biological function of creating a collective consciousness, and that requires that the unifying quality of that consciousness should be false, that is 'stupid', and it requires immense intelligence to ensure that this is so. Obviously the role of structure is that of guiding people sensibly along the path of stupidity most unifying, this is how structure is linked to linguistic force, and the false knowledge it creates. Darwinism and science is an immense structure and by adhering to its dictates we do well as individuals, and the collective being based on Judaism, is secured.

## Musolff's bounty

As if my usual habit when reading a book I scour the bibliography or notes for titles of interest, and Musolff's book is such a rare item in its dealing with organicism that it has been marvellous in this respect. A longstanding desire on my part has been the origin of the most famous phrase of all time from an Atheist Science point of view, the 'social organism'. I know it from Auguste Comte's *Positive Philosophy* of the 1830s and I did get diverted along major lines of exploration under the name of Fourier, and his disciple Hugh Doherty, the latter writing a series of books on organicist philosophy, but from a devoutly Christian angle. The other line of searching concerned the acknowledge precursors of Comte's ideas, most especially Saint-Simon. None of this was any use, but here, with Musolff, although diverting onto a parallel track of body politic phraseology, we finally get some hope of a solution to this question, always assuming that Comte did not conjure up the idea of a social organism from thin air, which always seemed unlikely because the idea is used so matter-of-factly in his book translated by Martineau.

The new lead has come from dipping into *The Body Politic : Corporeal Metaphor in Revolutionary France, 1770-1800* by Antoine de Baecque, 1997, first published in French in 1993. Chapter two is *Sieyès, Doctor of the Body Politic*, where we are told that Emmanuel Sieyès wrote several works that heavily laboured the organicist metaphor in a variety of ways. As luck would have it these works have been translated in recent years and today, Tuesday, 03 June 2014, I ordered a copy of his political writings. So now I hope to scour his work for the supreme scientific phrase of human biological nature, should be good ! But even without the appearance of this phrase i have already noted several close approximation appearing in Baecque's text, such as 'social body', 'political organism' and 'Privileged body', all on page eighty five. The last phrase looks ambiguous in terms of our interest but it is intended to refer to a distinct section of the social body that acts as a master race organ, like the Jews in real life, and is identified here as a distinct organic entity by this terminology. All very fascinating already. So even without the actual phrase 'social organism' being used itself, we already have a mass of evidence that this outlook was certainly very much in vogue in France during Comte's formative years and hence this finally solves the problem I have long desired to solve as regards the origin of this most important idea at the root of modern science, the cause of the first world war, the rise of Hitler and the Nazis, the holocaust, the creation of Israel and the imposition of multiculturalism as the global phase of the Jewish master race project comes into play, *as an expression of human biological corporate nature*.

Of further interest is a section dealing with the precursors of the eighteenth century French interest in this mode of thinking about society, as Baecque discusses a number of Spanish authors from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I have already downloaded a PDF copy of *The Examination of Mens Wits* by Juan Huarte, 1594. The basic idea is that people are predisposed to certain occupations by virtue of the intellectual makeup, and Huarte proposes to account for this. The gist of this idea certainly befits the core principle of individual nonexistence, wherein these variations obviously lend themselves to the principle that a variety of individuals exist to serve the organisation of a complex living being a level of social organisation, which is indeed a true scientific model of human nature and existence. So this really is wonderful stuff and we owe it all to the genius of a modern academic, they are so good at what they do, the tragedy is that as professional knowledge artisans their job is to possess knowledge with a view to controlling it by ensuring that only propaganda is produced in keeping with the core political message derived from the religious identity programme which forms the core metal content of the living human superorganism. Tragic that is from our personal point of view, but as we do not exist, it is perhaps a tragedy with a

hollow ring to it. If these people were to set themselves to doing what I do the result would be amazing, we would live in a world where all our human magnificence was reduced to the most ordinary status, along with the universe itself ! Oh so droll ! And what a world we would live in then, utopia on earth. But instead we have Hitler and his cronies like Musolff, because that is how nature has ordained it should be by making talking mammals.

There is an interesting advert for an image of Sieyès stating :

**EMMANUEL JOSEPH SIEYES [1748-1836] Theorist of French Revolution who coined the term 'sociologie'.**

Auguste Comte being famous for coining the term 'sociology' ! According to the dealer the image is cut from *Iconographie des Contemporains depuis 1789 Jusqu'a 1829*, and the PDF copy of volume two, with this image, has no accompanying text, so where did the dealer get this snippet of information ? Lets ask him shall we – oh, no need :

From Wikipedia, *History of Sociology*, taken Wednesday, 04 June 2014.

The term (“*sociologie*”) was first coined by the French essayist [Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès](#) (1748–1836),<sup>[13]</sup> from the Latin: *socius*, “companion” ; and the suffix -*ology*, “the study of”, from Greek λόγος, *lógos*, “knowledge”.<sup>[14][15]</sup>

In 1838, the French-thinker Auguste Comte tweaked the meaning of the term sociology, to give it the definition that it holds today.<sup>[14]</sup> Comte had earlier expressed his work as “social physics”, but that term had been appropriated by others, most notably a Belgian statistician, [Adolphe Quetelet](#) (1796–1874). Writing after the original [enlightenment political philosophers](#) of [social contract](#), Comte hoped to unify all studies of humankind through the scientific understanding of the social realm. His own sociological scheme was typical of the 19th century humanists ; he believed all human life passed through distinct historical stages and that, if one could grasp this progress, one could prescribe the remedies for social ills. Sociology was to be the “queen science” in Comte’s schema ; all basic physical sciences had to arrive first, leading to the most fundamentally difficult science of human society itself.<sup>[14]</sup> Comte has thus come to be viewed as the “Father of Sociology”.<sup>[14]</sup> Comte delineated his broader philosophy of science in [The Course in Positive Philosophy](#) [1830–1842], whereas his [A General View of Positivism](#) (1865) emphasized the particular goals of sociology.

That seems pretty authoritative then, shame we do not have a similar account regarding the phrase ‘social organism’. Which though prompted me to search for ‘social organism’ on Wikipedia, and there it was, short, not too clever, but definitely there. And here is an opening for me to get editing Wikipedia ! Coming soon. What about ‘body politic’, surely that has a page, but if it does you’d certainly think it would be linked to ‘social organism’ as it was linked to ‘superorganism’ for example.

## Origin of Nazi Antisemitism

Thursday, 17 July 2014 – I am sitting in the sun, on what is supposed to be the hottest day of the year, its gorgeous, and still only nine o'clock. Even more gorgeous is the book I am reading, Jacob's translation of Dühring's work on the Jews, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, 1997 (1881), this is truly amazing. So much so that we are going to have to break off from transcribing notes on Musolff and discuss this remarkable piece of work.

This work is remarkable for the manner in which it anticipates Hitler's antisemitism. Anything you want to ask about Hitler's antisemitism, it turns out, you want to ask about this work written nearly half a century earlier. The difference being that Dühring is obviously a source for the ideas that perplex us in Hitler's work, that now looks like a bland, slavish copy, as far as 'Hitler's' ideas on the Jews are concerned. And Dühring writes more extensively on the faults of the Jews, and the other perplexing question in Hitler's phantasm of hate, that of Christianity's exoneration from condemnation as a Jewish creed, as in, Why did Hitler continue to support Christianity and want the German people to remain Christian ?

The translation published by Jacob is a slim volume focusing on the faults of the Jews, but it is pure invective, verbal slander, without any factual evidence explaining the reasons why Dühring holds the views of Jewish nature that he does, it is bereft of any detailed explanation for the views asserted on the malignity, and basic inhumanity of Jews. If I think of my relevant experience of Jews for example, I can outline specific cases of people I have known, schoolboy drug dealers, wizened old landlords, insurance cheats, factory managers commuting over a hundred miles to be part of *their* community, which certainly lends weight to the idea that the Jews are different to the rest of us, and often in precisely the 'other' exploiting, Jew oriented way, that people like Dühring speak of in more general descriptive terms. My experiences are few and far between, and one can only suppose that people like Dühring had a great deal of experience of this kind of behaviour as a cultural disposition, certainly if I had known a community of Jews and seen the same distinctions amongst them generally I would undoubtedly of characterised Jews as Dühring and others have. But Dühring does not provide this kind of background experience to support his assertions. Are we all suppose to just know this Jewish character ? Only a month back, today being Monday, 21 July 2014, I was talking at the bar of a pub in town to a Londoner who moved north twenty years ago, who was saying that the school he went to was full of Jews, so that people in that area would be in a position to get a definite impression of Jews as something different from the rest of us, if they were, though he had no bad words for them.

## Judaism as an economic migrant culture

Even without factual evidence proving the complaints of Jewish parasitic behaviour in material terms, the nature of Jewish social form being what it is, as aliens within, the attacks on Jews always have a rational basis due to this alien status always being linked to a uniquely exploitative mode of subsistence by means of trade, trade being of its nature *exploitative* of others labour. Aliens are found living in countries as a menial class, like the Filipinos working in Saudi Arabia at the present time, or as a slave class, as with the Africans in America a couple of centuries ago, but this exclusively lowly manual labouring role has never been the nature of the Jew's position in Christian society, where historically, they have consequently held a most curious status as aliens within, but special aliens, present because



they choose to be, as 'economic migrants' having a *migrant* culture that remains permanently alien, allowing their descendants to remain aliens acting as economic migrants forever. Clearly the terms 'migrant' and 'alien' are related terms, identifying different aspect of one situation, and these features have been made the core character of Judaism.

So that Jewish culture is that of an economic migrant ideology, whereby they make their unusual living *by virtue of being aliens*. It is no longer possible to be so blunt about this special alien role because the constitution of the world's societies has changed radically since the two world wars, but the Jews remain an unusual cultural entity within Britain, and now, through Israel, they stand out as unique in the world. Unusual in Britain for the same basic reason of being an alien implant, relative to the main indigenous population, and indeed, since the liberation of aliens brought about by the mass importation of Muslims, and any other primitive cultural bloc, Jews have taken to displaying extreme expressions of their alien identity, as with the string set up in 'their' quarter in Manchester, to allow them to go outside on the sabbath without leaving a specific area that their moronic religious regulations forbid. It is outrageous that we pander to these primitive behaviours, we have been flushed through a time warp back into the most primitive ages of society since Hitler worked his magic for the Jews. Dühring's general attack on the Jews concerns the way they earn a living by way of trade, engaged in as an exploitative enterprise however, without any refinement such as a care for honesty or quality, only an unqualified avarice. In chapter four, *Political and Social Unsuitability*, he does talk about the penetration of important elements of society where the Jew can bring their corrupting influence to bear, in academia, the press, and in law making. This process of corruption he calls Judaising, and it is difficult to relate to what he has in mind in our own present time because what stood out then is now all pervading, the corrupted state is an established structure, I always say we are ruled by criminals that make the law. The Judaising influence must still be ongoing for we are most definitely still ruled by Jews, think of Tony Blair, no Jew could ever be more Jewish than this Christian prime minister was in office, and remains so in his role as some kind of ambassador to the Middle East, from where he is keeping well out of the way at this moment as the Jews bomb the hell out of Gaza (Friday, 25 July 2014).

If we give the 'Judaising' influence a tangible form by saying that the Jewish culture is an ideology evolved by linguistic force in reaction to the rise of civilization, wherein the economic migrant became the engine of civilized society because of the need for a workforce to service a society engorged by the economic engine of agrarian industry, and all that it has made possible in terms of industry henceforth, then we have a basis upon which to rationalise the way Jews are perceived by the likes of Dühring. Certainly the general flow of propaganda today refutes the accusations of people like this who are labelled anti-Semitic, but that is because of the Hitler Taboo giving the Jews the upper hand at the present time. But if Judaism is a formulation of life prompted by finding oneself in the position of an economic migrant, then all makes sense, even the variation of Christianity produced as a cultural identity to empower the dispossessed of the Roman empire and thereby turn the people of the world into Jews, makes sense as a mode of economic migrant ideology, formulated in reaction to the presence of a mass of dispossessed indigenous people, reduced to the status of aliens in their own lands, that is they have the status of economic migrants in their own land. This is how the alien turns the tables on those they initially served, and the Jewish culture is evolved to make this turnabout a permanent condition for the Jews, but it is a dynamic situation, and hence the ever present counter reaction of antisemitism. And of course this is a biological process generated by human corporate nature, expressed through linguistic force creating knowledge, hence the Jews have manifested this migrant culture in a book form, ideal for a mobile culture whose territory is abstracted into an identity without a material social form fixed in a territory.

From this position we may look at our world today and see the Judaization of our society in the transformation it has undergone in the last half century into a society existing *for the economic migrant*, where the hated flood of immigrants is constantly defended on the basis that we cannot exist without them, so that we need the millions of immigrants corrupting our culture and overpopulating our world, and introducing disgusting ideologies like that of Islam. Thus Judaization is in fact complete in our society, it is the ideology of immigrant supremacy over indigenous culture, the final triumph of Judaism. And this view of our world makes perfect sense and reaches right back to all that Dühring complains of when he objects to the enfranchisement of the Jews, this liberalisation for Jews was in reality the first overt act in the transformation of society into a culture for the immigrant, which is what it has become. This is justifiably called a culture for the Jews, a Judaization, just as a Christian society is a society that has by definition undergone Judaization, as indeed Muslim society is the same. So that generalised into this form whereby Judaism is seen as a religion idealising the economic migrant, that obtains its status from the fact that the economic migrant is in reality the primary economic requirement of a civilized society, brings all the loose ends of the Jewish Question together and weaves them into a coherent idea of what Judaism is in all its ramifications, good and bad, to explain what Jews are, and why they exist. In short they are the people of civilized essence because their image is made in the image of God as the embodiment of economic migration, whether that essence of alien worker is found in actual migrant alien status, or in the alienated status within their own land due to being dispossessed by an alien master taking over. This in turn explains how a ruler like the Romans can in reality be a slave of the Jew, because they were preparing the human biomass for penetration by the supreme class of economic migrant, and transforming the continental biomass into a class of economic migrant in residence, by dispossessing them of their ownership of the land, of their identity attachment to the territory they occupied, so that in the aftermath of Roman invasion they became workers for the alien rulers, just as economic migrants always are. So that is it, Judaism is a religion of economic status fundamental to civilization. From which it makes perfect sense that the Jews should be as all powerful as history shows them to be, since whoever controls the purse strings controls everything, and this the Jews do by virtue of their religion of civilisation's economic essence, the religion of economic migration.

But our present migrant culture can only be an intermediate stage that will settle back into a more solid form under Islam, in a few centuries time, this being the miserable fate of the world, because the Muslim identity is the ultimate slave identity, with Islam being a slave identity of Judaism, always and forever. Yesterday, 25/07/2014, Channel Four News showed a spokesperson speaking in Gaza, an Imam I should think, standing in front of a mosque blasted to smithereens, with only its concrete skeleton recognisable, and lots of people amongst the wreckage, as he boasted that within hours of being struck by a Jewish bomb the people had flocked there to pray ! Sad lunatics. This says it all about how vile and disgusting, how utterly degrading of our humanity, Islam is, it tears the *soul* out of people leaving their personality in a permanently bombed out state, where all that remains is a mindless devotion to Islam, to Judaism that is, to the superorganism indeed, which is what nature wanted when it made the human animal as a superorganism, but to a freedom loving Englishman this is the worst of all possible nightmares.

Reasoning thus begs the more precise question as to how exactly Judaism as a linguistic identity formula operates as a religion of the economic migrant role, existing as the primary role of civilised organisation ? As a general statement according to our Atheist Science principles we must envisage linguistic force creating the civilised form of social structure and within it the migrant becoming a loosely constituted permanent major element,

linguistic force would constantly flow through the migrant body and eventually give rise to an organised form, as per the latent potential of such a social element. This means generating an identity with associated behavioural programming. Dühring constantly refers to the misanthropic character of the Jew being seen throughout their history, and being revealed in a religion which makes them the chosen of an all powerful God that hates all other gods, all other peoples in other words, and demands complete obedience from the Jews, making their religion a slave-religion. This kind of linguistic identity programme sounds tailor made for the job of empowering a migrant worker class structurally alienated from the peoples amongst whom they live, defining feature their status as a people possessed by a cultural identity generated by linguistic force in response to its prior generation of civilised social structure.

Dühring however has no interest in an abstract understanding of social life as he finds it. He wants to see the inherently Jewish attributes underlying their misbegotten place in society as a genetic feature of people who thereby become Jews. The logic of this idea is so absurd it beggars belief, and yet of course it has since been the basis of all ideas expressing animosity for the Jews, and, we should note, nothing could be better for the Jews than this misdirection, or worse for those who would like to oppose the Jews. This does not mean that antisemites know they are serving Judaism, it is more likely they are obeying the dictates of linguistic force that obliges individuals to serve their own bias identity programme. So that an individual readily seeks out the contrasting points in the social dynamics impinging upon them, and interprets them according to their bias point of view, wherefrom the two alternatives are German versus Jew, and the only possible root of any deep-seated difference here does indeed have to be genetic, otherwise any criticism made of the Jew would be applicable to the German, thus absolving the Jew of any inherent fault, and thus making the whole exercise of criticism pointless. By selecting a false political cause as the primary problem in the Jewish presence in society, the Jew hater obeys the dictates of the false pivot of individuality that can only generate knowledge in a form producing social structure that ultimately must orbit the pivot of power in the superorganism which also ultimately, is identified with the Jewish identity formulated to be the foci of power, by expressing the essence of society's power rooted in the existence of a dispossessed biomass, epitomised by the core essence of migrant status, the Jew. The slave ruler made master by virtue of their existence being formed to serve the master, the master being the abstract being of the superorganism. This theme of the slave made master by serving the master is used repeatedly by Dühring, so he identifies a key factor making Jews so significant a social element within *seemingly* none Jewish societies, but then he merely gives this structural relationship a personal twist, rather than a functional one based on the fact that the human animal is a superorganism, and Jews have no existence as an end in themselves.

What Dühring chose to identify in personalised terms as racial identity, is in reality the genetic identity of the species, as we often say, the Jewish identity programme captures the essence of human biological corporate nature that belongs to the human animal as a superorganism. We have objectified this Jewish biological nature in terms of a structural feature of the newly emerging superorganic form, based upon a hierarchical structural delineation, within which the dispossessed biomass forms the basic building block of superorganic form under civilized conditions. Thus we obtain a new means of objectifying both antisemitism, and the attributes of Jewish exploitative master race identity. So, in terms of our principle of alternative focal points of observation and interpretation, we have a true feature of existence in the genetic, that is the biological basis of human nature, which on the one hand produces racism by being interpreted according to the false pivot of individuality, and on the other produces the correct model of reality by recognising that the genetic basis of human nature is an attribute of superorganic form, that over time delivered its maximum

potential in the complex, hierarchically structured global society, based on an identity evolved to express the essence of this society by being modelled upon the dispossessed status of migrant labour.

Friday, 25 July 2014 – Three books just arrived, one of them is called *The Dispossessed Majority*, by Wilmot Robertson, which is a modern anti-Semitic treatise, at least in the sense that Jews are part of the minority that has dispossessed the European based American majority. This is an interesting book to turn to as we examine Dühring's ideas on race because it shows how the same ideas have continued down the decades. It is also of interest that this author speaks of a dispossessed majority in a way that tallies perfectly with the idea we have just hit upon of calling Judaism the culture of a class of people evolved to perform precisely this operation of disenfranchising the majority, severing the people within a territory they rule, from the seat of power, by interceding in the structures of power that always exist, and always take the same functional form of administering wealth.

This is what the Jews do, they intercede between the body of people and the authorities that rule them through the agencies of social power, and that is what Dühring describes as he outlines his issues with the enfranchisement of Jews in Germany. And Robertson makes the exact same complaint against the Jews in chapter fifteen, *The Jews*, where he talks about their inordinate overrepresentation in the structures of power in America compared to the proportion of the biomass they compose. And so, the story continues, as indeed it must as long as Jews exist, and, not only that, according to our current reasoning, but as long as civilization exists, because the Jews are an essential structural element of that physiological arrangement that merely represents the fulfilment of human biological corporate nature. The structures of civilization can exist without the Jews, but it is the presence of the Jews that incrementally empowers the expression of these structures organising power, once again forming a further structure that unleashes the latent potential of human biological corporate nature therefore. So that we find that while human biological corporate nature is eternal and unchanging, its potential is continuously released via the process of linguistic force generating new social structures serving as engines of superorganic being, whereupon each new engine, each new social structure, constitutes a new foci of latent potential, which sets up the conditions for a new development to exploit that latent potential of human corporate nature. The Jews are one such new structure of exploitation, which has facilitated the creation of a global superorganism. According to which analysis, we may envisage a culmination of Jewish power being reached when one uniform global society exists, which could require a millennia, or two, who knows, but is certainly where we are headed at present. Such a condition, empowered by who knows what technology, may bring into being the kind of world envisaged in the Jewish sci-fi fantasy *Star Trek*. We may by then be dispersed onto other planets, and the process of linguistic force generating new forms that hold latent potential which induces new modes of exploitation in still newer structures, will then continue. With space vehicles propelled by nuclear propulsion of some sort, we may have the ability to engage in interstellar travel by this time. And the questions that animate us around the issues of Jews and Nazis may be null and void by then because we may of merged into one global species without any structural differentiation discernable in the form we currently recognise as 'racial'. So the issues that are of so much interest now, may not be recognisable at all in the future. In the meantime, they are of interest, and I would like to discuss an important section of Dühring's work that I just reached today, Friday, 25 July 2014 :

We have however accommodated ourselves previously to the Jewish standpoint which likes, for good reasons, to appeal to religious tolerance where, not

the latter, but the tolerance with regard to race is in question. The two sorts of tolerance have an infinitely different meaning. In the case of the race, one tolerates the entire man ; with the religion, only a dogma of the same. To demand tolerance towards a race of morally bad and of unsocial characteristics hostile to the remaining human race means to presume a thousand times more than tolerating in confession and ritual a religion which consists in mere articles of faith and can be accepted or laid aside. The Jews always act as if it were, in the case of their toleration, a matter of a confession, such as the Catholic or Evangelical, which can be peculiar to the most diverse modern racial groups. At present, in general, it is a question mostly not at all of the Jewish religion but of the entire moral, social and economic activity of the Jewish tribe and whether one has to tolerate this. But even when the religion comes into question, the case will be one quite different from that of a confessional difference within the Germanic, Italic, and Slavic peoples. The Jewish religion is a racial religion, as the Jewish ethics is a racial ethics. It cannot be transferred to the other tribes and it would be a very comical idea to think of modern peoples as believers in the Jewish religion. The Jewish religion is so closely grown with the race that it forms indeed a political component of their most peculiar interests. The tolerance towards it is therefore not merely a religious one but becomes involuntarily much more, and here lies the point where one has to guard from making even the smallest concession.

2. According to what has been said previously on religious tolerance and especially on the apathetic form of the same, the religious bodies of the Jews do not really have a claim on the privileges and the rights of safety which they have taken possession of as an appendage, so to speak, of Christianity. The Christian Church has accepted the old Testament and therewith also the Jews, even if only in a subordinate position. To this situation do the Jewish bodies owe the fact that they have been allowed to set up in the Christian countries a religion of second rank, as it were, and that they have finally become participant in the privileged protection through penal law, similar to the Christian organisations, it would be quite different with them if they were considered and treated not from the grace of the Christian tradition, in spite of their deed against Christ, but still as the people to whom the mother of the Saviour belonged and whose religious fate had prepared the new Church. The Christian articles of faith have benefited the Jews more than everybody else. With their fleeting understanding they do not perceive however that, with their present-day conduct towards the Christian people, they saw off the bough on which they have so long sat. For this reason even this work is to be granted to them. They see already today more powerful elements enter the lists than the spirit of the Middle Ages had at its disposal with all its popular uprisings and persecutions. It is the individualities of the peoples and even the universal humanity which stirs against them. The nations are conscious of their self injured by the Jews and the nobler human mind begins to feel itself in full opposition to Judaism. It would be foolish here to wish to overlook the religion and the religious bodies. The religion is a fruit of the race, and will therefore be treated as such also from the point of view of race and culture. Religion embodies not mere ideas of the imagination but also feelings and principles. Religion is a sanctification of morals or of contradictions of morality ; it is a sanctification of the racial nature. The Jewish religion is therefore a sanctification of the Jewish nature. One should guard from treating it as a matter of indifference.

It is however not merely the content of the Jewish religion which comes practically into question. The religious bodies of the Jews are political forms. They are a point of unification and serve as a support for everything which interests the

Jews in their life among the peoples in any way. At first they are the cadres for the religious Jews. But the merely racial Jews are in turn associated with the latter ; for, the narrow social intercourse of Jewish blood is also restricted almost as a rule to Jewish blood, be it now full blood or half blood. In this way, the social chain twines together. The Jew always recommends the Jew in the businesses. This pure association of interests indeed does not exclude the most vicious betrayal, but is strong enough to maintain a so to speak common racial business in reciprocity. If, now, the religious bodies were not present with their political privileges, the kernel of the organisation would fall herewith. The social association would indeed be able, as things stand - by virtue of their mastery of the press and by virtue of their nesting within trade - to continue to exist at the moment, but cannot maintain itself in the long run.

(pp. 146 – 8.)

Here Dühring gets to the nub of the question which his antisemitism makes its own, and bequeaths to the Nazis as the essence of its enacted anti-Semitic ideology. This makes this section worth reviewing with some precision. As ever, the quality of the translation leaves much to be desired, but it reveals how the idea is to make a rigid distinction between racial and religious attributes of identity. The logic here is based upon the correct distinction between race and religion, where race is biological and hence genetic, while religion is cultural and hence linguistic, and as such the one is integral to the individual where the other can be separated from them. This distinction is fundamental to our Atheist Science argument that treats genetic and linguistic information as biological information in two distinct modes of application, so that the detachment of religion from the genetic makeup of the individual is indeed the crucial point of interest, allowing the Jews to develop as the focal point of identity in a new kind of superorganism arising from the complex super massive social forms of the civilised, agrarian based economies. Our atheist science model is devastating to Judaism, whereas Dühring's model employing race as a medium of individual attributes is a kind of hyper individuality applied to the superorganism, and as such anathema to science, and the saviour of religion. We have all along recognised race as a lower order mode of corporate identity, which is superseded by religion in the Jewish form, and this powerful, liberating insight, freeing us from the oppression of Judaism, is precisely what Dühring negates with his race based idea of personality. This racism, like all antisemitism, is fantastic news for the Jews, it is their saviour. And it led to the modern form of this act of protection, which we call the Hitler Taboo. How fascinating that this idiotic idea, so obviously bad for all none Jews and great for Jews, because it preserves religion's account of itself, and negates the naturalistic account we offer by simply avoiding it, should appear when needed, and then come to dominate the world, first as Nazism and then as the Hitler Taboo. If we listen to Dühring this outcome can only be a deliberate ploy on the part of the Jews, engineered by them, it is an excruciating question to wonder how this outcome arises, why people did not choose to understand Judaism in naturalistic terms that would allow them to destroy it, if they hated it that much.

We can explain this outcome by using the idea of the false pivot of individuality which obliges all messages, as in all knowledge, to be in conformity to the one message, so that whether it is about hating Jews or loving them, the result is to enhance Judaism as long as the argument adheres to the logic of the individual as the end of existence, and that is exactly what we see in the above argument, where Dühring opposes the Jewish request for tolerance based on their identity being merely one of a confessional nature. This is of course not true, but instead of debunking this false claim by revealing that humans are superorganisms and religion provides the identity of the human animal, Dühring accepts the

false logic employed instinctively by the Jews, and thereby produces an argument which is equally false, but anti-Semitic. This is how Judaism always generates antisemitism by operating in a linguistic medium obedient to the false idea at the core of Judaism itself. So Dühring is not consciously helping the Jews, he is trying to oppose them, but like the Muslims firing useless rockets at Israel as we speak, killing one or two people, while enduring state of the art weaponry killing over 800 in response (25/07/2014), the attempt to go head to head with Judaism is futile. Only by shifting the pivot of observation to destroy the whole fabric of society can we hope to destroy Judaism. Interestingly at the beginning of this chapter, chapter five *The Way to the Solution*, he states that any solution to the Jewish Question requires a uniform, coordinated international response, because the Jews are everywhere, and more to the point, though he does not say it himself, Western Civilization is actually Jewish Civilization and it must be destroyed if we would destroy Judaism. Obviously our intention in Atheist Science is not to do anything practical, it is merely to do science, to reveal the true nature of reality as it is, so we recognise that any desire for freedom from Judaism is not possible, rather as we realise that possessing this knowledge is not actually possible, knowledge that the human animal is a superorganism is as we say, unknowable knowledge.

The idea that the Jewish religion is a racial religion is once again a distortion of a true fact, due to the use of the false pivot of individuality that localises the consequences of human biological attributes. The Jewish religion supplants the racial identity mode and as such it must define a people on a new basis, and that it certainly does. Where the confusion then sets in is from a misunderstanding of the Jewish slave identity of Christianity as a new identity existing in its own right, which it most definitely is not. Christianity is evolved to act as a slave identity of Judaism as surely as Judaism is evolved to act as a fixed identity of a people, so that the apparent introspection of the Jewish creed compared to the openness of the Christian creed is misrepresented as introspective versus loving. Whereas these alternative attributes exist because the first identity needed to define an unchanging corporate identity, whereas the second identity needed to project that identity onto a *range* of other dispossessed peoples making them Jews by another name, something it could only do if it was open in its remit and accepted any one regardless of race or culture. At one point Dühring says he is free from all conventional religion, but it is clear that in his antagonism for Judaism he is happy to employ Christianity as an alternative to Judaism, when in reality this is like employing the engine of a car to move the vehicle in a different direction to the wheels ! It is utter nonsense, and this should be obvious to a none Christian, but it is not, seemingly.

The above passage shows how the validity of a racial basis to Jewish identity is facilitated by the religion acting as the basis of a kind of none physical territory, so that the religious identity is a kind of disembodied state or nation which its people act towards as if it were a physical entity. Curiously enough this model of Judaism gives Jewish identity an inherently organicist nature as it takes upon itself the most idealised form of the body politic, created solely out of a linguistic formulation. This in turn is the perfect mode for a master race destined to vacate a territorial location to undergo a phase of disembodiment, during which it acts to organise a global biomass of dispossessed people to serve the power of a people whose nature is disembodiment itself ! Thus the disembodied rule the dispossessed, where all these abstruse notions of intangible states of being are an expression of the human animal's nature as a being created by linguistic force, which is in itself a kind of disembodiment act, because indeed the superorganism has something of a disembodied nature to it that makes it so hard for us to grasp hold of conceptually, because we cannot see the superorganism for the material substance of which it is made, which is none other than ourselves !! If only we could stop seeing ourselves, then the human animal we are part of would become visible to our mind's eye. But instead of reaching for an awareness of this

immaterial condition that is reality, we find ourselves being dragged into the quagmire of materiality that gives us racism and religion, and war and mayhem. We need to ditch the false pivot of individuality and adopt the true pivot of corporate being.

At the beginning of the above passage, Dühring says it is ludicrous to think of none Jews following the Jewish religion, which comes so close to begging the question as to other people being Jews by way of Christianity and Islam. There is a dual aspect to this statement. Firstly other people do follow the Jewish religion by being Christians and Muslims, that is the whole point ! But at the same time, the Jewish religion proper cannot be extended to other people, it has to be rendered into another mode, and this is most important, because the requirement for Judaism to advance as a master identity of global superorganic being, is that it should be able to preserve itself, this is the precondition. But Dühring's misinterpretation of the significance of this fact serves to reinforce it, at precisely the point in time when this fact should become a serious flaw in the continuance of Jewish identity, as religion came under attack from new ways of understanding existence related to science. So that once again we see it is the strident Jew hater that rescues Judaism from the none Jews, by emphasising precisely those features of Judaism that are essential to its existence as a master identity.

Saturday, 02 August 2014 – A quick session of reading this afternoon has brought me to a passage in Dühring that seems to answer a leading question playing on my mind since reading *Mein Kampf* a decade or so ago, as to why, and how, Hitler came to want the German people to remain Christian despite being aware that this meant being the slaves of the Jews ?

No racial group has more aptitude for the opposite of all equality than the Jews who, from the beginning, have given themselves out as the most God-willed aristocracy of mankind. Their entire Messianism is the incarnated God-willed self-interest which should take the earth in its possession and make all the peoples serviceable to it. One therefore may set against the insolence of the Jewish tribe and of the "slave form of religion" discovered by it, which is its politics, the rights of man and the right of nations as well as, in general, the natural principles of all justice.

(p. 154)

Although highly confusing in this garbled form, the gist of this passage hits upon a few key principles regarding the Jews as masters, and the rest of humanity as their slaves. Reading this today I sensed an awareness in the author, that the Jews were the master race and the rest of humanity were enslaved to Judaism, which, combined with the previous arguments seeking to separate Christianity from Judaism and preserve it as a standalone authority, it suddenly dawned on me that this was the secret of Hitler's attachment to Christianity despite his evident understanding that Christianity was a slave identity of Judaism. Dühring has been bandying on about how the Jews became masters by serving the master as slaves, and from this insinuated position wheedling their way into the positions of power. And that is what we see the Nazis doing, as set out by Dühring, from the position of having realised that to be Christian is to be a slave of Judaism. Wherefrom the immediate idea striking these people is not to destroy Judaism, but to take Judaism over. From which position it is indeed obvious that if Judaism is revealed to be a master identity, and Christianity its slave form, then the whole edifice is destroyed, making it impossible to take advantage of the insight in this way. What is required is an attack upon Judaism that allows the slaves to take Jewish power for themselves. This idea makes perfect sense of Hitler's strategy in every detail. The fixation of German national identity as the new master race



while preserving Christianity as the real seat of power currently vested in Jewish identity, by eradicating Jewish identity from European life. It all makes perfect sense, assuming the idea is to usurp Judaism. So that what follows from this insight is that the burgeoning knowledge of human nature had revealed the true nature of the relationship between Jewish religion and social order, but no neutral intellectuals described this model in detail as we do in Atheist Science, instead the first people who used the insights of science were men like Dühring who employed them in the usual political manner of seeking social domination.

Interestingly he says this shortly after remarking upon the way that the educated often play the game of pretending nonsense is good sense, in order to maintain authority (p. 150), and that is basically what we have just described in the idea of preserving Christianity while destroying Judaism, to manipulate a shift of real power. What still remains difficult to describe is how this idea of capturing power from the Jews managed to coalesce into a social vision which became real in the Nazis, and how this was never really about destroying the Jews because it was always a Jewish project, and could be nothing else. Such machinations are of a deep-seated nature in terms of their integration into the fabric of the Jewish social structure that is the living being of the superorganism.

What makes Nazis antisemitism into the saviour of Judaism is that, judging from the roots of the ideology seen in Dühring, the idea is a reaction against the real nature of Judaism as a master identity, which adheres to the core principle of Jewish ideas, that are fixed upon the pivot of observation that makes the individual the end in themselves. As we keep on saying, as long as an argument adheres to this false pivot of observation it will serve the superorganism whose structure is created around the Jewish identity on this basis. Only by adopting a true point of observation that recognises that the individual does not exist can the power of Judaism be destroyed, and at the same time all religion is made impossible because knowledge would then become literal. This truth was not wanted by the likes of Dühring and instead they set in train a movement intended to overthrow Judaism, which could never work because it relied on preserving the slave basis of Judaism, and making that basis the new master, an impossible goal, as history has proven.

Which brings us onto the question why Christianity cannot destroy Judaism and make itself the master ? Somehow or other the authorities always seem to understand that they need the Jews, the Romans knew this, and despite the show of animosity towards the Jews by the Church over the centuries, no real attempt has ever been made to suppress Judaism, which could easily of been done as proven by the frequent successful attempts to stamp out versions of Christianity that were deemed unhelpful. So this particular issue does verge on the form of a conspiracy, a covert understanding by the leaders of authority that the relationship between the Jews and Christianity has some essential aspect to it. Even today, with the relationship between America and Israel, we see the same fact in full view. Here it is explained by saying the Jewish lobby in America is immensely powerful, but that hardly tells us why this should be so, why the Christian authorities do not simply eradicate the small body of Jews ? Something they could easily do, if they wanted to.

The easiest setting in which to get a handle on the vital role of Jews within a social body is within the Roman Empire, where the special dispensation granted the Jews compared to all other peoples, in effect gave the Jews the role of slaves of the master on a social wide scale, whereby the Jews became akin to the nervous tissue of a living animal, serving the Romans in the guise of the brain centre in this analogy. This is so because the Jews were thereby recognised as alien to all other peoples on an official level, people whom they nonetheless had permission to dwell amongst, and hence if attacked by the people they could call upon the masters for defence. This made them the spies of the Romans over their captured, enslaved territories, but in a most subtle way, not based on any official position, but

rather organically defined by virtue of the Jew's self imposed, as it were, self alienating identity.

From an organicist point of view the relationship is seen theoretically in structural terms. The Jews form a connective tissue dispersed throughout the global biomass and this gives them a covert power which the reality of their power in the Christian world, and before this, as in the Roman Empire, indicates is real, although describing its reality is not easy to do in everyday terms. Books have been written on the nature of the Jewish influence, and it generally revolves around the control of wealth, and Dühring makes a similar point when he refers to the Jewish habit of trading and being in business. So we may as well settle upon this as the true nature of the power that makes the Jews vital to Christian existence, and take it that the leaders of our world know this is so, and hence they never turn on their masters, the Jews, except in times of crisis when the whole edifice of Judaism is being rocked, and then the attacks are a form of defence of Judaism, only displaying antisemitism as a device to cleanse society of the flux of linguistic force that threatens all religion. Which explains why in the end the ultimate antisemitism culminated in a taboo that made a real science of human nature impossible, and thus saved Judaism, and all religion, for the future, that we live in now.

When it comes to the defence of Christianity, Dühring gets into an explanatory groove, but one that has all the makings of a political argument defending an assumed position. We shall turn to the subject of Christianity by taking a passage from Jacob's translation :

should the German, the Frenchman or any other nationality feel solidarity with the views of those Hebraic documents which have been imported as the appendages of Christianity ? We Germans have certainly little reason to artificially mislead the feelings to which our Nordic skies and our Nordic world have stirred us for millennia through the passions of Hebraic Orientalism. The Old Testament is a thoroughly alien book and must become increasingly more alien if we do not wish to alter our character in the long run. In dark times the error could creep in that this piece of Judaism belongs to Christianity. In more enlightened times, on the contrary, the consciousness arises that Christianity was only a reaction against Judaism which, however, was not able to accomplish itself in the Jewish sphere itself. Accordingly, the other peoples will have to see in that chief prophet who arose among the Jews only a spiritual force which sought to redeem the Jews from themselves. But neither have the Jews been redeemed from themselves and their inherited nature nor the world from the nuisance which the mixture with Judaism has imposed on it. On the contrary, Christianity has drawn the Jews into world-history behind itself, as it were, and secured everywhere at least a role of second rank among the modern cultured peoples. This protection which Christianity let the Jews participate at least in an existence of second rank is today silenced by the Jews themselves as a rule. Indeed, Christianity is referred to by the Jews, that is, by the Jewish writers, in a manner which must insult not merely a Christian but, in general, every noble thinking person. The highest martyrdom for mankind, which deserves consideration under all circumstances, has been exposed to the Jewish sneering, and often precisely to the vile Jewish wit, because, in the enlightened public, the better human feelings were too far undermined by the Jewish and half-Jewish press and literature to be able to attain any longer to any powerful counteraction and to ban writings of such a Jewish tone. But this would have been the only means of establishing the damaged human morality

in its rights once again, against the Jews. A literature in which this human morality can no longer be publicised emphatically against the universal Jewish wit has abandoned its best aspect. It is lost if it does not recover the power of establishing the better national way of feeling and thought.

Accordingly, one need not hesitate in the least - with regard to the activity of the Jews which is precisely against the purely human and historically better traits of Christianity - to take the Old Testament as the real Jewish original document and as the characterising mark of the Jewish race and its religion.

(Jacob, p. 77.)

When I read *Mein Kampf* a decade ago I was amazed to find that Hitler hated atheism and was committed to Christianity. My attempts to understand this position led me to realise that this was pure pragmatism, on the face of it. Hitler understood that while Christianity was a slave identity of Judaism, he had no problem with the Germans being the slaves of the Jews in perpetuity because he knew this identity was the basis of modern political power and the old Teutonic religions could not serve as a replacement for Christianity. This understanding still left a couple of important questions, as in how the rationale was worked out regarding the separation of Christianity from Judaism, and also, if Hitler could be this pragmatic about Christianity, then what was the true nature of his adoption of antisemitism, was it too, merely a device, serving a political end, and if it were, what was that end, was it the end it actually did serve, namely that of furthering the interests of the Jewish master race as necessity demanded at this point in the development of the Jewish global superorganism ?

Wednesday, 06 August 2014 – I wrote the above paragraph some weeks before writing the preceding passage where my insights on Hitler and Christianity have been advanced by my further reading of Dühring, but we can leave the above paragraph to indicate how this process of enlightenment developed, in order to understand it better. The point is that Dühring spells out the idea of separating Christianity from Judaism, and eradicating Judaism, and he seeks to justify his asserted difference between these two identity modes, at length, as can be seen in the above quote where he divides the Bible between the two Jewish identities. Hitler does enter into this subject, he merely acts on the mature agenda developed by Dühring, and that is what makes us flounder about in search of the justification behind Hitler's contradictory attitude on the crucial point of retaining Christianity while hating the Jews. Evidently the idea of preserving the Christian slave identity was acceptable on the basis that the slave was about to destroy the master and occupy the master role in their own name, as Germans, but ones still practicing Judaism in the guise of Christianity. This is actually a fascinating scenario to get to grips with in the modern world because it sheds light on the process that took place in the ancient world when the Sumerian culture was occupied in precisely this manner, by the slave biomass that the masters had imported to run their society, taking over that society from within. The one remaining sign indicating that the body snatching had taken place, was that the new masters preserved one core aspect of their old identity. What was it ? I thought they even took to using the Sumerian language, sorry I cannot remember. Now where did I get that knowledge, it was so long ago ?

—

How on earth could we ever hope to pursue an answer to such questions as those closing the earlier paragraph above ? I had no hope, these interesting questions were left hanging in the air, but in our examination of Dühring we see Hitler's attitude spelt out, by the man who wrote the programme of race hatred, that Hitler merely put into effect. In the Dühring we see the most fascinating identification of Christianity as a slave identity of

Judaism, descriptively expressed, not directly. When he says that Christianity has drawn the Jews into world history, and in such a way as to allow the Jews to hold at least a second rank to Christians, he is coming very close to identifying the conditions that cause us to say that the Jews are the master race, and all other peoples are made slaves of Judaism by way of Christianity. Except he does not allow this interpretation to arise, he keeps the two identities strictly separate, and this is done by virtue of the subliminal logic of the individual being an end in themselves, showing the power of a pivot of observation to control complex ideas. By adopting an organicist view of human nature which dismisses discrete identity forms and makes all variation part of one structure, the obvious fact that this drawing into world history was something very different becomes accessible, and the situation can be seen to be the exact opposite of that described by Dühring. Christianity drew people into the orbit of the Jews, thereby drawing the people of the world toward the foci of superorganic being, whose life history is the true nature of what Dühring calls 'world-history'.

So once again we see the criticality of pivots of observation underpinning the manner in which ideas are interpreted. This allows us to understand how a man like Dühring, and Hitler in turn, could take on the role of Antisemite without any idea that they are acting as the supreme agents of Judaism thereby, by merely responding to facts in a way that serves Judaism because they are interpreting the reality of the Jewish presence according to the false idea of individuality which lies at the core of the Jewish linguistic identity programme. And the motivation for taking this approach, beyond the mere programming, is that in this way the detractors of Jewish master race power, place themselves in the position of master race, something which Hitler did expressly, so that this miscreant activity is not at all innocent, it is mechanistically programmed, while also being motivated by self-interest, of exactly the same kind that the detractors find so offensive in the aliens they attack. Indeed Dühring makes much of how the Jews have a moral code amongst themselves, but none for none Jews, but in effect this is what he sets up according to his own set of cultural values. It is not as if he seeks any kind of neutral or unbiased evaluation of what it is that is going on here, even though he wants to employ a supposedly scientific concept such as that of race to serve his political reasoning of hatred against the Jews. He makes out that knowledge of racial identity is part of the new knowledge of animal nature, as it applies to the variety of humans, something that was in the air in his day. Why not just get to grips with the whole situation and seek a fully scientific argument, that comprehends all human actions according to one idea ? Because that would deliver no advantage to him. And therein lies the key to understanding that these ideas are regular political machinations, they are not real complaints born of true issues. And all that we can discern in Dühring has to be transferable to Hitler's reasoning, only adjusted in terms of the fact that by Hitler's time there had been half a century of distillation of linguistic force and its products, to refine the product of these structural outcomes. And that is what made Hitler so sharply focused, and we must assume what brought home the need for a demonstrable act of antisemitism, as in the holocaust, to give bite to the movement that in the end was only part of the ongoing dynamic of Jewish master race identity.

The poor quality of the translation does not help, but a good translation would not give any more definition supporting our interpretation of its meaning, we may be sure, an interpretation that is a valid extraction from what Dühring is saying here. But our specific interpretation of Dühring only reflects what we say all the time about the nature of antisemitism. The wonder is then, why did no one else ever say what we say ? My attempts to follow up on what the vitriolic hatred of the Jews in the late nineteenth century did for an evaluation of Christianity, bore next to no fruit, but the slight references to a call for a return to German pagan religions, and the abusive nature of Christianity as a tool of Jewish exploitation, was enough to convince me that the crucial idea that Christianity was a slave

identity of Judaism, was evident and public at this time, and in the expression seen above from Dühring we can see how this idea was hard to avoid. Dühring is at pains to avoid damaging Christianity, as was Hitler, a stance that was vital to the Jews because the process of fostering an anti-Semitic backlash would propel Judaism toward the attainment of Israel at last, and provide a taboo against attacking Jews as the master race, as we know happened. So that in other words, this kind of wild antisemitism displayed by Dühring which became the model for action under Hitler, begins to look like a deliberate effort on the part of Jewish interests to provide what the Jews must always of known was the crucial feature of their unique position as an alien master living within a slave biomass, that of a contrived reaction against them, stimulating the flow of linguistic force in a manner that serves the Jewish master race role within the superorganism, preserving identity by drawing all the forces of society toward it, yes in a manner that looks bad, but which history teaches us is anything but, from the unique position of an alien master identity within.

The nagging question regarding Hitler has always been whether or not he really knew that he was an agent of Judaism in disguise, and now we must transfer the same question to Dühring, as indeed we always do with all vitriolic Jew haters, since they are always devoutly, not to say fanatically Christian, as with the British National Party. But what we see in this odd looking contrast between believing in Christ and hating Jews, is a feature of the identity dynamics built into the structural relationship between these creeds. And it would seem that this is the *real* nature of the conflict, it is written into the arrangement as part of the contrivance to ensure separation between the origin of Christianity in Judaism, and the independence of Christianity, which is essential to its function as a slave identity of Judaism that it was self evidently created to be in the first place. So there is no true conspiracy here, this is linguistic force playing out in social form, and the deliberate connivance is part of the political operation of ruling society through institutions deriving their authority from being religious identity structures. Political figures are conspiratorial, always, all the time, they always devise plans and then seek to impose them by whatever means, except those of openness and honesty. So an element of conspiracy is always present in the public arena, but we must be cautious how we identify it, in order to not to allow the accusation of conspiracy theorist to be levelled against us, as this is a linguistic device of defamation and ridicule, helping authority control knowledge to its own ends.

The most astounding find amongst Dühring's observations is that the Jewish religion is a slave religion, and that in their obedience to it the Jews adopt the position of master slave, a stance which is transferred to secular realms so that the Jews make themselves the slaves of the highest political authority, and in that way they become the vile creatures of exploitation they are known to be. This is so close to capturing the essence of Judaism as a master race identity made so by capturing the role of identity in the human superorganism, that we expound in our Atheist Science, that it amounts to a unique statement on the true nature of the Jews. However, for all this, we still do not get a proper account of the Jews. By a 'proper' account we mean a factual account, without bias. So this means we have a very solid account of what the Jews are as a social body, but one that is heavily biased by the views and interests of Dühring. Which leads us to ask what those interests were that they would want to make such a target of the Jews ? Put simply he has views that many of us would hold, and nowadays we would describe them as anti-capitalist, and all the criticisms of Jewish money grubbing trading practices, where exploitation is the name of the game, for maximum profit without any effort, is what those of us who hate capitalism, would say is the essence of capitalism. It is interesting in this regard that we have a book like that of Rothschild's *Bionomics* based on the principle of a corporate nature, which argues that capitalism is inevitable. Which is indeed the point, Jewish culture is a natural expression of human

biological corporate nature, that Dühring personalises and makes a culpable attribute of the Jews by bringing the spurious subject of race into the topic of Jewish nature. This is where the question, Who invented race, or racism ?, seems to have some point to it. For used in this context the description of the Jews as a race becomes highly significant, being full of purpose, for without this device the criticisms of the Jews as master slave within the world, would be left without an explanation, and as such would provide its own answer, as in the Jews are superior. This answer would be informed by the bias, incorrect idea, that people are individuals existing in their own right, so the implicit answer to the role of the Jews as an exploitative elite within society is naturally inverted in an act of biased logic, that then requires an explanation, and this is where the idea of race enters the picture quite naturally, as there certainly could be no other means of applying a critical explanation of Jewish prowess in life, making the Jews culpable. Thus we have an explanation for the racial idea of the Jews seen in Dühring and Hitler, one based on the principle of alternative pivots of observation and explanation. So that the means by which the Jews created the Hitler Taboo to protect them from the rise of science that would of destroyed the religious foundations of their master race role in the superorganism, and of destroyed the superorganism itself thereby, is found to turn upon the function of the pivot of observation that informs all reasoning consciousness, on the basis that the person is the human animal. This false pivot spontaneously draws all ideas into its orbit and reflects them back in a form that will always ensure that the essence of the Jews as a master identity is preserved, exactly as we see in Dühring, which led inevitably to Hitler. So that no person created this idea of race or racism, it was generated by the process of superorganic identity formation that is a constant ongoing product of the expression of linguistic force that forms the essence of human existence as a superorganism.

In a posting to Wikipedia last week, on Jewish identity, today being Wednesday, 06 August 2014, I argued that Jewish identity was a social structure, and I elaborated upon the idea that the latent potential of human biological corporate nature was constantly being accumulated in ever more complex social structures, where the anatomy of racial identity was a social structure communicating corporate identity to individuals at an earlier stage of superorganic being, which is superseded by the anatomy of linguistic speech, also a social structure in its own right, with a latent potential projecting further social structures into the social space that constitutes the being of the superorganism. So that there is an inherent clash of dynamics between racial and linguistic identity formulas as both exist to create social structure, where linguistic identity emerges from the anatomical identity of race in a more powerful mode of expression, creating more powerful social structures, and hence, regarding the above remarks here, the behavioural fallback upon a racial strategy as a means of enacting a political separation from Jewish identity, one destined however, to lose in a war with Judaism, because racial identity creates a less powerful social structure than religious identity. This is why antisemitism always serves Judaism, because it harks back to a less powerful mode of social growth, but it is the only strategy open to the enslaved biomass.

We learn from others that Dühring was a socialist and a positivist, a student of Comte therefore, which latter point is most interesting in that he must of been well acquainted with the idea of the social organism, although no real sign of this appears in the translation of his ideas on the nature of the Jews, though a couple of organicist type terms are used. The translation itself is very poor, as if it were translated by someone who did not speak English as their first language and was unable to apply the normal mode of English expression to the German, despite being able to translate the literal meaning of the words. This makes a fluent reading of the text tricky.

## Race education

In attempting to figure out where Hitler's anti-Semitic ideas arose from, having discovered they were formed in the mind of Dühring, we pass the question on accordingly. Since Dühring gives us no direct evidence of the foundation for his anti-Semitic views in his piece on the Jews, and other related ideas such as the Jews being a race genetically distinct from other humans in a most unpleasant way, we are obliged to speculate as to why he produced the anti-Semitic ideas that he did at this time. The one thing we have to go on is his extended attack on Lessing, and turning to Lessing to see what we can discern about him, we find there is a great deal of interesting material of relevance to Dühring's anti-Semitic views, and even his views on the nature of race may have light shed on them by way of Lessing's ideas on this subject. In his essay on the Jews Dühring does refer to a couple of his other works on economics and history as containing extended and detailed arguments about the malign influence of Jews on society, but these are only available in the original German and are therefore beyond our reach, and cannot be considered here.

*The Education of the Human Race* (a copy arrived yesterday, 05/08/2014, yet to examine it) sets up the Jews as a primitive people selected by God to receive a revelation, which they would then teach to all humans. It is a very curious work, and it is easy to see how these slight elements of curious reasoning might engender the counter argument that we find in Dühring's uncompromising hatred of Jews. The logic of Dühring's seemingly absurd ideas appears readily in view the moment we get to grips with this work by Lessing, and take account of the deep hatred Dühring had for Lessing. Dühring's antisemitism, with its unique racist aspect, was a direct response to Lessing's eulogy to Judaism as the font of all wisdom. Which in turn explains why Dühring would go to so much trouble to extricate Christianity from Judaism, seen in the book we have in hand, but dealt with more fully in a work devoted to the topic : *Der Ersatz der Religion durch Vollkommenes und die Ausscheidung alles Judäerthums durch den modernen Völkergeist*. My translation software renders this as : *The Replacement of the Religion through more Perfect and of the Separation all Judäerthums through the Modern Peoples Intellect*. I am afraid I cannot see any easy way to improve on this translation, so it can stand as it is. Meanwhile I have since decided that the ultimate explanation for the preservation of Christianity is to be found in the ideas stated above, in terms of the usurpation of the Jews as masters by their slave body, the Christians.

By 'race' Lessing evidently meant what we would term 'species', even though we still use the word 'race' in the same way today, when speaking of the human race. Given the manner in which Lessing employed the word in connection with an argument making the Jews the educators of all humanity, it is easy to see why a detractor reacting directly to this argument would seek to attack the meaning of the word 'race' that Lessing had used to mean one unified humanity. Hence the bizarre, utterly unjustifiable idea of the Jews as a distinct race of human beings, and, if this idea had no other points of origin, we would find in such a conflict the potential origin of the idea of race as the basis of what we know as racism, wherein racial differences are made the overt sign of underlying differences of human attributes of both the most treasured, and reviled kind. Which, if so, would make the argument over the Jews entry into society originating in Lessing's promotion thereof, the very birth of racism, which is fascinating for this racism has been the very rebirth of Judaism, without which Judaism could not possibly of survived into the modern era. Without racism protecting Judaism by forbidding any real criticism of it, which is the essence of the Hitler Taboo, Judaism would of been prone, not so much to the vicious, nasty attacks of someone like Dühring, but the same kind of attacks that were being heaped on all forms of religion, so that protecting Judaism was the lynch pin of protecting religion per se, including Christianity

therefore. And Lessing was a devout Christian, so here, at last, we discover how the Jews created antisemitism to save themselves, by way of their slave agents, the Christians, always an obvious idea, but without tracing the path followed by linguistic force in its generation of Nazism, it was never quite possible to frame this statement on the origin of Nazi antisemitism, as we readily do now. I say he was a devout 'Christian', according to the preface in the edition of his *Education* by Haney, 1908, he was always committed to belief in God, and I am currently assuming he was raised a Christian. Dühring talks at length about him being a Jew, but he seems to mean by this that Lessing had the genetic, biological constitution of a Jew, a ludicrous idea perfectly in keeping with the idea that the Jews are a separate species of human being, wherein Lessing is therefore a biological Jew raised as a Christian, whose Jewish nature shows through in his work ! Dühring really went to town on expressing this wholly idiotic model of Jewish biological nature, once he had concocted it, and obviously, given the false premises, the product is logical. That is not saying much on the face of it, but that is the basis of all false knowledge, religion specifically, so one can hardly accuse Dühring of being especially contemptible on this basis.

What is appealing about Lessing's *Education*, upon first inspection, is the theme being in keeping with the idea of linguistic force projecting into social space, which its projection as such creates, where it condenses into knowledge that acts as a programme organising people to create superorganic form. In his account of the education of humanity, what Atheist Science calls 'linguistic force', equates to God, and the projection of this force into social space in the form of 'knowledge' can be identified with what Lessing calls 'revelation'. So that he says, that all peoples initially had only a crude understanding of the reality of existence, and it was only by special knowledge being imparted to some people that we attained the heights of civilization that we have today. As an intuitive approximation to the truth this is loosely accurate, in that it accommodates the new anthropological type of knowledge of human diversity and primitive conditions, that was coming forth in Lessing's time. But whereas we would like to see a naturalistic explanation of the process whereby knowledge accumulated amongst some peoples, Lessing is dead set on fitting the new anthropological knowledge into the story of Christian life. Because of the nature of the new factual knowledge that was driving the new religious formula of accommodation to reality, the resulting account took on the general outline of a naturalistic model, and hence we have this similarity of process and essence between the entirely fictional, bias, religious description of Lessing's, and our strictly scientific, factual, and correct account of how we arrived at a global social condition where all people are as one now, as all are now Jews.

Haney's preface has one feature that we may mention, as it is in keeping with the process of knowledge formation under the pressure of linguistic force that is so apt to this time when Lessing was working, and the bud of Nazism was therefore erupting from its point of origin in the being of the Jewish superorganism. Haney specifically describes the origin of Lessing's ideas in terms of the social milieu and the ideas of other writers, giving a strong impression of the influence of a new current of linguistic force occurring as a flow of new factual knowledge at this time, a mass of new data about reality in effect, factual data about our world. And hence a new counter knowledge arose in spontaneous reaction, as part of the extended flux of linguistic force, reacting to points of conflict with established ideas that had been created where a void in real knowledge had permitted functional knowledge of organic identity, to develop into the body of knowledge that is religion and such like. Thus a new expression of false knowledge maintaining the remit of religion as a superorganic identity continued to control knowledge by accommodating the new factual information involved in the arrival of new real knowledge, that was becoming science, ensuring that the fictional



formulations of factual data were established as 'science' within the structures of knowledge control, that at root are the universities.

Saturday, 09 August 2014 – Last night I had what is nowadays a rare conversation with an acquaintance in a bar in town, where I tried to impress upon him that the ability to speak defined humans as the wings of birds or the gills of fish, defined these creatures. But in the end all I seemed to get from my intelligent companion, was the response that linguistic anatomy meant that we *communicate*. This response was obviously not what I wanted, but it stumped me as I tried to get to the difficult idea that this anatomy created superorganic form, as in *social structure*. So that, to respond directly to the reply I drew from this man : we do not communicate, the superorganism communicates, so that we are communicated with, we are part of the anatomy of communication of the human animal we might say. It is as if *God* speaks to us, as this relationship has been intuitively understood, functionally. Saying that linguistic anatomy evolved to enable communication is to impose a block on what language is, and does, in other words it brings this biological attribute to an end, it has been created, now, what do we do with it ? Anything we like, is the usual answer. Making us into ends in ourselves, from whence the act of communication can proceed. This is a good example of how language delivers our state of consciousness, and how a particular mode of consciousness is written into our spoken language. So that a word like 'communicate' is formed with a meaning that embodies the idea that we are ends in ourselves. A process managed by a social elite, performing a role within an institution of authority created by the action of linguistic force. And this is why I was stopped in my thinking tracks, when this routine response was given to what I was trying to say. In the end I do not think I got anywhere in terms of delivering my idea that we are a superorganism, a fact made evident by virtue of our physiology of linguistic communication. Nice to have a natter though, and, as can be seen, attempts at verbal expression serve as a test for my efforts to *communicate* my ideas. And of course in this context I am acting as an end in myself, which is why my efforts can get nowhere in terms of becoming public knowledge, as I have no position of authority within the anatomy of our Jewish superorganism.

---

If we think about the nature of the Hitler Taboo as being that of a block upon the impact of new knowledge, upon Judaism as the essence of religion, or false knowledge, or superorganic identity, then this taboo is linked to modern knowledge of reality that is science. It therefore makes sense that any natural process generating this taboo as a mechanism of superorganic physiology should be linked to the appearance of the new knowledge we call 'science'. It makes sense then, that the point of origin of Nazism should be in the same period when this new real knowledge was being seen for the first time and making an impact upon the ideas of people creating knowledge in the form of books. It also makes sense that the detailed substance of Nazism that makes it so relevant in terms of blocking the effect of new knowledge of reality upon the established false knowledge of identity, should be linked to the specific knowledge that poses a direct threat to Judaism as the essence of superorganic being. And that is precisely what we have discovered in the work of Lessing, in his essay *Education*, which not only adapts new anthropological knowledge of reality to religion, but even adapts it to Judaism ! Quite a remarkable discovery, the roots of Nazi antisemitism, and found in the work of an author who was as Judophilic as it is possible for anyone to be !!

And it is easy to see from this overview of how Nazi antisemitism came to be created by way of a Christian reaction to modern science, as it impacted directly upon the nature of humans and hence upon religion, how all of these processes occurred spontaneously, without

any individual being conscious of their role in the process, each participant therein merely reacting to the stage of knowledge development they find themselves involved in. So that Lessing reacted to the emergence of ideas described by Haney, and Dühring in turn, reacted to Lessing's reaction, both responding in the standard manner of Christian programming, which has always contained a vein of antisemitism in it, that is vital to the delineation of the master organ defined by Judaism from its slave body, defined by Christianity. Lessing's idea makes perfect sense from the core assumption he works to, a false pivot of observation that is, which says there is a God who created all things, and this God has chosen the Jews as the agents of His communication with His special creation, humans. Likewise Dühring's ideas are equally logical given that they obey the logic dictated by the same false pivot of observation as that used by Lessing, which ultimately comes to the primary false pivot of individuality, but in these specific cases is seen in the recognition of the validity of religious belief. Lessing and Dühring only differ in adopting the alternate possibilities, that of unity versus that of difference, unity under Judaism, or diversion from Judaism to Christianity as the message from God transferred into a new distinct people. These models of reality are all valid enough on a certain level, they are essentially the political expression of individuals, as individuals express their bias relative to Judaism and its slave identities. Behind all of these manifestations of linguistic force in action, lies the scientific reality of a species of mammal evolved to form a superorganism, whose form is generated by the flow of linguistic force into the form of knowledge creating a pattern of organisation from which the biomass takes its social structure, animated by these various political delineations of the central pattern of knowledge. Thus in Lessing and Dühring we see a particular strand of the pattern of social organisation being generated, in which we discover a deep interest because it turns out that this particular strand led directly to the creation of a uniquely extreme form of political expression that took the eruption of science from a bud of enlightenment, to a scar of taboo, sealing over science indefinitely.

Slightly off topic, Haney's background to Lessing leads to the remark that deism was a major line of thinking at the time, which had the idea that whatever is, is right, as its core logic. This principle has filtered out in our reasoning as the purest essence of science, because we are so often confronted by the contrary idea that when it comes to humans most of what pertains is flawed—we are imperfect,—which is a corollary of humans being self made, and therefore not made by nature, implying that we must constantly work hard to make ourselves better. This is what makes the likes of Dawkins' atheism so fundamentally religious, his principle being that religion is a flaw that we ought to, and can, as rational beings, overcome. Which drives us to oppose this covert religious influence by asserting that the essence of science is that all that is, is as it should be, and cannot be otherwise. But here we discover that the rise of science created precisely this insight, leading to Deism. The only question now, is what is Deism ? I wanted to know this for a long time, and I came upon an answer not so long ago, which I wrote down, but I am buggered if I can remember it, I mean 'Deism', its just another 'ism', who wants to know what it means, why do we not just have science ! Anyway from the section in Haney it looks like this essence of scientific logic is being employed to make humans special, so that if so, it is a case of the usual political bias entering the picture, and this shows that even by fixing a principle, in language, there is no getting hold of truth, anything can be subverted to a political cause. That is the nature of language, if it were not then it would not function as a biological attribute of a living animal.

In his discussion of deism Haney mentions a few works, including John Toland's *Christianity not Mysteriorious*, 1696, which is concerned with the nature of revelation as an allusion to that which is real, and as such a medium of education, which seems to anticipate Lessing's work, and in addition we find that Toland also published a work promoting the

toleration of the Jews on a par with all other 'nations', wherefrom it appears that Lessing's *Education* combines the two ideas of Toland into one idea. Which takes our search for the roots of Nazi antisemitism even further back into the origin of modern scientific thought and its impact upon religion, as opening up the idea of what religion is.

It is as we always say then, religion created Nazism. Specifically, Judaism created the holocaust, it cannot be otherwise. Always understanding that all there is is the superorganism, and these events are the result of an entirely natural process, wherein religion is merely the form of linguistic information we select as the focus of our argument, to make the link in terms that we can understand in an everyday sense.

Wednesday, 23 July 2014 – Now I have drawn my attention to the lack of specific evidence in Dühring I am noticing it when it appears, page 127 discusses Lassalle as a Jew displaying manipulative behaviour, and 130 repeats earlier references to a manipulation of the law by Jews now allowed into the political administration, where people are forced to employ lawyers, a profession dominated by Jews. This kind of manipulation of law making is of course standard practice in our capitalist world today, and much hated by me, although unnoticed, or never remarked upon, by anyone else.

### **Judaising society**

Dühring speaks constantly of the Judaising of society, by which he means the reduction of all political and economic affairs to a Jewish mode of reasoning, in which condition the population is rendered prone to exploitation. This is seen in many parts of the text but I happen to be reading page 132 at the moment, which is specific to this subject. As a general outlook the idea of the Judaization of society makes perfect sense, but only from the initial point of view that makes Christianity the foundation of the process *as we know it*. And therein lies the problem with his whole work denouncing Judaism. Why not recognise that it is Christianity that sets up the whole situation whereby the Jews come to exploit us in the first place? He does recognise this, implicitly, but he goes out of his way to excise Christianity from its link to Judaism, thus preserving the special character of Christianity as a slave identity of Judaism, that has desirable qualities of unity enhancement, that are formed to make people compliant slaves, without exploitative drives, that he chooses to treat as such, so that the benefit of a Jewish slave body can be preserved, while being detached from the Judaism without which it cannot exist. This preservation of Christianity from Judaism is a deeply contrived exercise, which he must of been as fully conscious of as anyone who seeks to oppose an alternative way of doing things, as right opposes left, and so on.

Searching for the authors identified by Haney yesterday, 23/07/2014, as in Toland, Tindal, and Voltaire, I happened upon *The Philosophy of History* by Bazin, 1829, and as luck would have it I bought a copy in America in poor condition, for just thirty quid. The must have attraction lay in the statement that humans were made for society by virtue of their biological nature, the most important principle of modern science, always denied, because its implications lead directly to the fact that the human animal is a superorganism. Nice to see its naturalness noted in the days of innocence, before Darwin and the corruption of all modern knowledge. But aside from this delightful statement on the true scientific basis of sociology, the work begins by talking about the races and species of men. As such it provides a good example from the period of how these terms were used in a matter-of-fact

manner, without any qualms about their applicability. This indicates that there was yet to be a sorting out about what the nature of humans as animals was, and in the meantime we see the all too human rise of the race informed antisemitism leading directly to Nazism, on the basis of this early imprecision about human nature as animal forms.

### **Necessity of a protective taboo to the enfranchisement of Jews**

Dürring meets the omission of examples complained of above as we get into chapter four. Page 133 describes the rotten state of academia and how this made it a target of the Jews. This suits the idea that knowledge must be controlled in order to protect the superorganic identity, which means Jewish identity. Then we find the rotten state of the press comes into view on page 135. This prompts thoughts on the phone hacking scandal which has recently climaxed in the trial of senior editors from the Murdoch press, which is Jewish owned, something that no one has ever mentioned. What we despise in the press is presumably exactly the kind of low behaviour that Dürring would have in mind when talking of its Judaization. He says this corruption of social structure is due to the liberalisation of Jewish conditions, and since Jews have continued to dominate our world, we must see that if this outcome is true, which it certainly seems to be, then the only way the Jews could survive the backlash of this increased overt exploitation of the slave biomass, is by virtue of a most powerful taboo, the Hitler Taboo indeed. Last night, 23/07/2014, *Newsnight* on BBC 2 had an exchange between a Tory and a Labour MP about the right of Israel to commit wholesale murder, in which the Tory stated that given the experience of viewers watching at home during the Nazis holocaust it was an act of antisemitism to merely compare the Jews to the Nazis, which presumably people were doing with the ongoing bombardment of Gaza which has killed 600 civilians to some thirty Jews, two of which were civilians. This is the Hitler Taboo in action. Without the work of the Nazis the Jews could not possibly behave as they do, and therefore the generation of the Hitler Taboo derived from the creation of Dürring's antisemitism, responding to Jewish liberalisation, was an inevitable product of linguistic force, the force of language driving the organisation of the human superorganism about a core of social authority vested in identity.

What this means is, that the promotion of Judaism leads to the hatred of Jews because, come what may, the Jews exist to exploit the main biomass they live within, which is not identified as Jewish, although in point of fact wherever Jews live the mass of people are implicitly reduced to being Jews, in the same way that any parasitic organism converts the parasitized organism into itself by virtue of the nature of its mode of living. So that the anti dynamic of this positive dynamic, for the Jews, is an inevitability, with one thing leading inevitably to the next, because of the nature of the Jews as a cultural body.

A further point of interest in this chapter four, appears where it says :

All things must serve one who is a Jew, no matter whether they are good or bad.  
(p. 134)

The most distinctive idea to appear in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* is that which says there can only be one message, it may appear in an infinite variety of forms, but all forms must always say the same thing. Where he got this most precious knowledge from has always been the nagging question. And here we find the exact same principle revealed in a lesser form, connected with practical affairs for a specific group, a specific identity that is, but the group/identity that it applies to in its highest form, as a principle of master race identity personification. From this principle we derive the idea that we are all Jews, irrespective of

the names we know ourselves by, because the Jewish identity is the One identity that all others cannot avoid existing in obedience to, because the social structure is oriented toward a focal point that the Jews occupy. Which leads us back to the principle we just noted whereby the nature of the Jews means their overt inclusion in society requires a powerful taboo to allow them to operate without causing a reaction leading to their rejection, as happened in many locations in the past, including Britain.

So it appears that the refined principle found in Hitler's work was freely accessible in the works dealing with the nature of the Jews as enemies of German society. It is very nice to find an answer to this seemingly abstruse question, thought to be impossible to answer because it had the feel of a piece of refined wisdom, whereas it is evident as a practical insight of the organ of master power that employs it as part of its cultural identity programme.

### **Essence of master race power described as we know it in life**

On page 162 – 3 we have a wonderful description of how we are farmed by an alien authority, something we talk about all the time by way of the destruction of English culture and the absolute hatred of our freedoms that our politicians have, as they draw Muslims into our world and do anything to foster these vile alien cultures, while passing laws to make us evil if we so much as murmur a word of complaint about this. Here Dühring speaks of the Jews in precisely these terms :

One will have to remember that the Jews conduct the battle for their expansion and for the accompanying destruction and hemming in of elements of the better nationalities with well-known unscrupulousness and with all means which correspond to the bad moral constitution of their race. If they had had the power for that, the other nations would have long disappeared or at most been left over in the role of slaves of the Jews, as objects of work-exploitation. Such a condition is indeed the only idol which the otherwise so ideal-less Jewish people has had in view from the primordial beginning. In consideration of that, we do not sink into any false morality of a battle for existence but only exercise a right in the interest of the universal humanity and self-maintenance of the better mankind when we dedicate ourselves to such a revolution, as it were, against the undertakings instituted against humanity. The Jews who strive for the repression, and subjection to interest, of the members of all other peoples are justly to be measured with their own standard. It would therefore mean misunderstanding all of humanity if one wished here to hesitate for even just a moment and shrink from instituting the battle against the Jews seriously, for the sake of a lasting neutralisation.

The Judaization of the peoples and all conditions is the fact, dejudaisation the task. This task cannot be resolved in its entire scope all at once ; but it must be undertaken immediately in all directions. The three most important fields of work in which it is to be entered upon are, as already demonstrated, the political, the economic, and the social. In view of the determination of the immediate measures, for the execution of which one has to work as speedily as possible, the question can be thrown up whether the political differences in the conditions of the nations do not bring with them also essential differences in the dejudaisation procedures. To this it is to be answered that everywhere the means lying most immediately and the most speedily accomplishable are to be chosen and that, in this selection, the consideration of the forms and characters of the governments can have only little weight. The Jews

have only one measure for the governments and, correspondingly, even we have to control only one political means against the Jews. The Jews battle the best government as a bad one if it does not condescend to supporting the Judaization of the nation. On the other hand, they glorify the worst government as excellent if it works into their hands. And for them not freedom but only the Jewish rule is the decisive measure. They always prefer a freedom-opposed government which however favours the Jewish privileges and the Jewish rule to a free one, if the latter protects the nation against Jewish exploitation. If the case is reversed, they are apparently for freedom because they can thereby work for their Jewish monopoly. The entire ladder of all forms and characters of the political conditions, from the most Conservative to the most revolutionary, is in itself indifferent to them and weighed out only according to the advantages which can thereby be made in the business of the Judaization of the peoples. The Jews are never for the freedom and welfare of the peoples ; what they bring forward and advertise is business hypocrisy which serves to deceive the public and to set about in a masked way for the Jewish political business. Where it suits them, the Jews flatter the people and hide themselves with the same means of flattery behind the princes and other political power-holders. The latter is indeed their original and most chosen chief way to create influence and privileges for themselves. They manage at the same time to be zealous in their presses against personal power where this is in the way of their advantages, and in other directions to claim, through underhand means, even this personal power with personal flatteries so that it works in the most personal way for the Jewish advantage. At all times, the Jews have sought to cling to the emperors, kings, ministers and other power-holders in order to reach their goal through personal intrigues.

(pp. 162 – 163.)

If that is not the most exquisite description of the world we live in today, I cannot think what could be better ; except for the blunt focus upon Jews, that is. This is something we could never discern today, so how he identified this Jewish role in organising society like this is beyond me. Our political class rules us as aliens, treating us exactly as he describes Jews treating us, without a care for anything constituting a value, although always professing values, as disguises for their biased interests. But of course the nagging idea in our minds when we see this happening to us, is to wonder who these aliens that we elect to act as agents of our hidden exploiters, really are, where do they get their goals from if they are not our goals ? And this of course is from religion, which ultimately means Judaism, which brings us right to where Dühring is ; except for his focus on Jews to the exclusion of others, which is perplexing. He has just been talking about the infiltration of Jews into the political establishment, but this still requires a mass of German/Christian power mongers cooperating with this process, so why single out the Jews ? This does not help our understanding of the situation, and of course we have already determined that Dühring is acting as all public voices always do, as a priest seeking to accrue advantage to themselves, and this requires him to relate his individuality to a political body, hence the racial divide between the master identity of Judaism and the intended replacement, provided by German identity. In effect he is being a proper Jew, as he describes Jews, and therefore he is himself serving Judaism as a master slave, creating the taboo instead of revealing an unbiased truth, as we do in Atheist Science.

---

Friday, 21 August 2015 – Driving to work in Hull this morning, a distance of 120 miles, I mused on a recent news report of comments made by Gordon Brown on the Jeremy Corbyn affair, where a socialist is in danger of becoming the leader of a socialist party, much to the horror of the leaders who have devoted their lives to making the left into a capitalist poodle mimicking rightwing ideology. It was just the statement saying that taking Labour back to ideas popular in the seventies, when socialist regimes were seen as favoured organisations, was unthinkable, that captured my attention, for by lining ourselves up with the likes of Russia, North Korea and Hamas, Brown said, would never aid the realisation of one international consensus. This was inspired by Corbyn speaking of Hamas as welcome friends in an address some time ago.

Brown is a devoted Christian, the offspring of a professional religious priest, and in this statement he reveals the true nature of his interest in politics, to further the Jewish agenda of global domination, transposed into Christian world brotherhood type ideology. The interesting thing about this is that it is the biological imperative inherent in human biological corporate nature driving humanity to form one global superorganism. Raising the question where the approval for this idea, as stated, ever came from politically, as he implies is the case? Which is nowhere, except as a reaction against world war, also linked to the establishment of Europe as a single superstate. So these actual leaders reveal that they are in power because they have only one goal, to serve the imperative of human existence imposed upon our kind by nature. Which is all very well, but these leaders do not know this is so, and hence we do not often get this reasoning revealed in an accessible form like this, that we can take notice of and relate to Atheist Science principles concerning human biological nature.

Thursday, 03 September 2015 – Continuing this theme, we are in the midst of an ‘immigration crisis’, according to the media machine fronting political power, as Hungry builds fences and closes railway stations while immigrants demand their right to invade Europe. No one dare say anything about this, all wring their hands in agony at the difficulty and say, we must help these poor people . . . and let them in. Once again, Jewish slave ideology, Christianity, informs this pacifist logic employed in the face of violence driving people across the globe, forcing Europe to come into line with the global population explosion arising in the Third World, not allowing us to act according to choice about how we live, instead allowing the global Jewish superorganism to grow in keeping with the life energy potential provided by modern technology, or ‘science’, as it is called. Religion is the programme creating the human superorganism, as seen by these intense events in the life of the animal undergoing immense spurts in its growth.

---

Returning to Dühring, it certainly does no good to defame the Jews in this way, as history more than amply proves. The point is to develop an understanding of these dynamics. The best way to understand the Jews seen in this way, as exploiters, is to render this activity into a neutral, functional form, based on a mechanistic model, so that instead of ‘parasite’ being employed as a descriptive term, we would prefer something like ‘catalyst’. The whole point is that the human animal is a superorganism and once it has attained a certain level of development, associated with farming which unleashes the latent potential of human biological corporate nature, making the emergence of a true mammalian superorganism real, in a form we call ‘civilised’, then a facilitating part of the structure of the kind described in the above passage by Dühring, becomes necessary. Structural elements of a hierarchical nature form and take on a definite appearance, but underlying this overarching social structure of power there must be something giving the rigidity a flexibility that counteracts

what would otherwise be stifling to growth. Thus structures like a monarchy or a state deliver stable fixed form, or a religion indeed, but underlying this fixed identity the obvious antidote is going to be an alien identity that works in conjunction with the fixed identity, but is nonetheless not synonymous with that identity, and that is what we see being described in the name of the Jews above, but in terms of an alternative species, a parasite. When we speak thus of social structure balancing rigidity with flexibility we might think of the historical facts pertaining to the history of civilisations, where questions are asked about why some vanished. In our era the famous example would be that of China, an ancient, powerful, advanced civilisation that attained stability, but gave way to the impress of the flexibility that rules our world, gave way to Judaism that is, albeit under a primarily economic appearance of capitalism that avoids the appearance of Judaism altogether, although Judaism in China had its identity representation in communism, and still does, despite it being perfectly evident that China is a rabidly capitalist society.

The idea Dühring is presenting is that ideally the rulers of the peoples are as one with the peoples, and this normal social relationship is subverted by the Jews to serve their own ends at the expense of that of the peoples they live amongst as aliens. But this model of social disjunction is a misrepresentation of reality, very much in keeping with the devious ways of the Jews, as described by Dühring. And that is the point, the elite that is generated by the action of linguistic force creating social form, is just as alien as the Jews in terms of its exploitative nature, that is the nature of the arrangement whereby the wealth of the mass of the people is appropriated under the control of a minimal number of powerful people defined by their place within a structure of control. All the presence of the Jews does is add a further dimension to this delineation of power, and in doing so their mode of aiding the process is so empowering to the established elite because of its subtle degree of detachment from the established social structure that the Jews have become the true masters of humanity, by turning the established masters, and hence the masses, into Jews themselves ! This in the form of Christians or Muslims, or communists indeed, and such like shades of Judaism. But all of this only expresses the realisation of the latent potential of human biological corporate nature, driven by the power of language that we call 'linguistic force'.

I have just, today being Monday, 14 September 2015, obtained an unusually good book on linguistics that I will take notice of at once. *Patterns in the Mind : Language and Human Nature* by Ray Jackendoff, 1993, picks up on the excellent ideas of Chomsky regarding universal grammar, showing the true biological nature of the power of human speech. Sadly even this work fails to breach the taboo against science adopting the true pivot of observation that makes the human animal a superorganism and the person nonexistent, but because his subject is language treated as the real key to human biological nature, and his objective is to discover what human nature is as a natural phenomenon, and he starts from the correct basis that linguistic ability is a biological attribute, he asks all the right *type* of questions, and gives us some answers that are nicer than usual. His final chapter is *Social organization*, which is perfect, in principle, though entirely flawed by being science produced unwittingly in subservience to religion, to the message of being that is. So that he speaks of the child *constructing a world view* from its social input, as opposed to negating the individual and speaking of the individual being formed by a process of programming the child, under the action of superorganic physiology. Earlier on in the book he asks the most wonderful questions, which boil down to asking why an animal acquired the power of speech, absolutely perfect ! Although the result is as pathetic as can be. So that on page five he blabbers on about the task of understanding what the power of human speech is all about, being damnably difficult to fathom, when in fact it is ludicrously easy, *but*, taboo ! That is the point, the answer is forbidden to be given in our world, because science does not exist as



an independent department of knowledge, and we are without freedom of any kind in our society, unless we call an *illusion of freedom* a kind of freedom, which I decline to do now I know better.

---

Today the Hitler Taboo has secured the position of the Jews, so that when professional pundits deal with the kind of material presented above, discussing the nature of the Jews in hateful terms, they dismiss the possibility of there being any basis to this hatred, out of hand. This demonstrates that the Jews require this kind of mindless hatred in order to counter the rejection of their particular mode of contribution to the social process of superorganic being. This amelioration of antagonistic reactions is not unique to the Jewish structural element, the way a monarchy is formed into a kind of celebrity cult of the people, or the way a democratic state is made into the guardian of the people's identity and being, these are strategies of a like kind befitting the overt, massive structures of elite power appearing in these various forms. The nature of the Jewish role is covert and subtle, and hence we have the more abstract expression of linguistic force in the raw form of an anti-identity formula, safeguarding the linguistic identity formula of Judaism, as in antisemitism. Each mode of defence evolves in keeping with the structure it relates to, and the function the defence performs within the living body of the human animal superorganism.

I am especially thinking of Musolff when saying this about contemporary academics, how they avoid treating antisemitism as having any valid basis, but I recently managed to get my act together and identify a book that had escaped my attention when I read Musolff this summer, *The Language of Violence : Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf* by Felicity Rash, 2006, is a sickeningly snivelling item to judge from its opening platitudes playing up to the Jews. She talks about her revulsion at the language of hate employed against the Jews by Hitler. But apart from the wholly inappropriate nature of such a beginning in a book purporting to have an intellectual nature, given that the Nazis and Hitler are major historical figures, and no one needs to apologise for studying them in detail therefore, in the light of Dühring's work there is no call whatsoever to describe Hitler's hateful expressions as anything to do with him. This is how we find people speaking about the Jews century after century, millennia after millennia, and thank goodness they do if we care about the Jews, for without such mindless hatred the alternative, that of mindful description, would emerge as it does from my dancing fingers, and then Judaism is no more, if this Atheist Science knowledge ever becomes the norm.

We may support the claim that what Rash offers is a ranting Judophilic propaganda by noting a Jew doing the same thing on the topic of antisemitism in the 1940s :

I have never encountered anywhere else the especial loathing which the anti-Semite reserves for the Jew. It is a *peculiarly* pathological type of hatred  
(*The Great Hatred*, Samuel, 1943, pp. 98 – 99.)

Samuel describes examples and gives an intriguing explanation for this intense hatred which makes Christianity the true object of antisemitism, instead of its usual role as the seat of all such hatred. This indicates that what this unpleasant authoress denounces in *Mein Kampf* as disgusting, is perfectly normal for the genre of work she has presumed to study as a linguist, and to teach us about. There is no need for her to make such a fuss about Nazism per se if her intention is to explain a particular facet of language use.

It is true that people do not normally pay attention to anti-Semitic literature these days, and it is only the exceptional nature of the book in question and its author that alters

that rule, so we cannot be surprised that much handwringing accompanies such efforts, even when they are themselves purely exercises in dishonest manipulation, a kind of rewriting of history to blank out the ugly aspects of our world, ruled by the ignorance of Judaism as it is.

Ooh! Here's another good one :

The violence of the language used by St. John Chrysostom in his homilies against the Jews has never been exceeded by any preacher whose sermons have been recorded. Allowances must, no doubt, be made for the custom of the times, for passionate zeal, and for the fear that some tender shoots of Christian faith might be chilled by too much contact with Jews. But no amount of allowance can alter the fact that these homilies filled the minds of Christian congregations with a hatred which was transmitted to their children, and to their children's children, for many generations. These homilies, moreover, were used for centuries, in schools and in seminaries where priests were taught to preach, with St. John Chrysostom as their model—where priests were taught to hate, with St. John Chrysostom as their model. (*Europe and the Jews*, Hay, 1992, p. 27. First pub. 1950.)

He was one of the early Fathers of the church, and apart from verifying the normality of extreme verbal abuse related to the Jews, we get some additional information from this relating to the fact we always point out when discussing antisemitism, which is that it always comes from the Jewish slave host of Christianity, from the most passionate and devoutly Christian, that is. This is of course functional, as granted in the above, enabling a delineation between the slave and the master, and it shows us that Hitler was in perfect harmony with the antisemitism from the first days of the Christian slave identity's fabrication. Which lends further weight to the idea that the Nazis were a Jewish construction, in a long line of such constructions, required whenever times required a cleansing act against the host to secure the place of the Jewish master against complete rejection. That anti-Semitism is fundamental to Christianity seems evident enough from these considerations. And understandably so given that it is an entirely Jewish identity, as it had to be in order to be a slave identity of Judaism. So that a device within the slave identity programme of attachment was required to decouple the slave from its master while retaining the structural bond, always bearing in mind that this whole arrangement is biological, arising from the dynamics of superorganic identity formation.

### **Last judgement on Dühring**

His work on the Jews is quite amazing to read for one who has become fascinated with the status of the Jews as a master race, and hence sought out all that was available within the field of anti-Semitic writings. Dühring's work tops the lot. The elaboration of the role of the Jews within society is delivered in so matter-of-fact a manner as to serve as a kind of natural history of human society, as if the man were a naturalist of the same, merely describing the life he sees and experiences on a daily basis. Regrettably the detailed descriptions of a natural scene that we could expect from a naturalist, are largely absent from this particular work, though he does refer us to other works, where more detail is to be found perhaps.

The great problem with his argument however, is that it is founded upon a false pivot of interpretation, that of a *biological nature*. The reason we identify a new pivot of observation in his work is because he employs the correct pivot of observation, as in human

biological nature, but he misplaces the foci of this nature, making the Jews the product of a specifically Jewish biological nature that is distinct from that which other, 'higher 'peoples', of 'better qualities', have as their biological foundation. So the actual basis of the whole problem of the 'nightmare' of a Jewish presence in society, is a product of human biological corporate nature, which he misreads, to allow him to develop a political alternative to the 'Jewish problem'.

All his complaints about the state of society plagued by alien exploiters is descriptively accurate, and rightly targeted upon the Jews, because that is their function in society, described by Dühring in political terms. However, explaining this reality on the basis of Jewish racial identity, misplaces the truth that rests upon the pivot of human biological corporate nature. This allows his work to be fabulous, but entirely erroneous. Just the kind of thing to deliver a product of linguistic form such as the Nazis, as an expression of human biological corporate nature acting in support of the core identity of Judaism that the human animal must maintain as the essence of its living being.

### **Bringing antisemitism into disrepute**

Finally, in the closing pages of the book, he indicates that "seriousness and respectability had to prevail everywhere and thoroughly." (p. 191), as regards the activity of anti-Jewish associations. Which caused me to see in the monstrous representation of Dühring's programme for cleansing society of Jews, enacted by Hitler, the picking up of the one thing that Dühring had hereby warned against, as being detrimental to the cause of solving the Jewish problem. The end of the book describing the means of dealing with the Jewish question is all about employing political strategies implemented over great lengths of time, this is a radical difference from that which we see in the action of the Nazis *seemingly* implementing the programme developed by Dühring. Saying which, provided me with a piece of evidence to reason about that which seems so obvious, that in reality Hitler was a work of the covert power of Judaism acting at the core of the German state, doing exactly what we know was done with sociological organicism, as in its being made monstrous by an over zealous application of its principles to the development of a political ideology. Given that we know that Nazism did this for science, corrupted it, it makes perfect sense that the exact same programme of corruption was what Nazis antisemitism was all about. And of course understanding this is what this, our work, is all about, for this is the essence of the Hitler Taboo : the protection of master race identity personified in Judaism. Thus far we have made this taboo all about the control of science by bringing the idea of the social organism into disrepute, but it seems we may add the bringing of antisemitism into disrepute, which really makes sense. Lets repeat that : *Nazism was all about bringing antisemitism into disrepute*. YES !!

This is a very difficult idea to hit upon, because it runs so counter to all that is meant by 'antisemitism', which is something utterly terrible. How can something utterly terrible be brought into disrepute ! Its like talking about some rapists giving rape a bad name, or some murders likewise, it is a mode of expression that our language does not accommodate, or the constructions therefrom. And yet, in Dühring, as we have just noted, the anti-Semitic argument is delivered as a perfectly matter-of-fact programme of necessary social action. Indeed when he does include the phrase 'antisemitism', he always characterises it as a misnomer by saying 'so-called' antisemitism. So that Dühring was quite clear about delivering a normal political programme of dealing with a social problem, akin to that which Socialism sought to deal with as a larger mode of the social question, as he says himself.

Having said this however, Jacob adds an appendix consisting of material from the 1901 edition, in which the 'moderate' programme of measures to deal with the 'nightmare' of Judaism, is rejected as now null and void, as the intervening years had seen the state becoming ever more Judaised, and so Dühring does introduce talk of eradicating the Jews, and he brings into the discussion the idea of military measures. He still speaks of such measures in negative and undesirable terms, but we have the sense of a man who has devoted himself energetically to a cause all his life, seeing that the cause is lost, and now giving vent to a final attempt to see a way to victory. This is relevant to the subject because this is precisely the option taken up by Hitler, and given the interpretation of Nazism as acting against the caution recognised by Dühring we must acknowledge this change of heart expressed in his final words on the subject of the Jewish Question.

I like this latest insight into the nature of Nazism, and its ramifications for our representation of the Hitler Taboo. I am reluctant to give up the notion of this taboo being all about bringing antisemitism into disrepute along with sociological organicism, or science, and thus I am content to set aside any suggestion that these final thoughts on how to rid the peoples of the Jews constitutes the origin of the holocaust. However we get there, we do not rely upon social actions being the product of consciously acting individuals, so that quite what the significance is of these last thoughts of Dühring's in terms of delivering the Hitler Taboo, compared to whether the programme was picked up and developed in a more deliberate manner by covert elements that understood the need for a war of evil to clear the air of the anti-Semitic threat, is a matter of subtle interpretation, there is no question about what occurred and its result : war and mayhem, protecting Jews from all antisemitism henceforth, and from any threat from a true science of human nature.

---

Tuesday, 12 August 2014 – I have to record this somewhere, and this is where I am working at present. Yesterday the news included reports of The Islamic State, which crashed into the news a few weeks ago as ISIS (Islamic State in Syria, I believe this means ; also known as ISIL, Islamic State in the Levant, as I understand this abbreviation to mean.), but has since erased the border between northern Iraq and Syria and moved within tens of miles of Baghdad, and hence declared an Islamic state, and evidently renamed itself accordingly ! It was reported that they had 10,000 soldiers under their command and a billion pounds in capital, it being a Sunni Muslim movement funded by states like that of Saudi, if I have recalled these details correctly. But the point of interest was the 500 *British* soldiers within the ranks. I have always said you cannot be Muslim and British, because being British means being part of a culture that places freedom above all else, in principle at least, and such like Western liberal values. And while all religion is fascistic by nature, the modern formula of Western values based on a Humanistic theme of rationalism and freedom of the individual, has forced Christianity to moderate its inherently fascistic, oppressive values, which Islam has not had to do, coming from openly fascistic political countries where the state is a religious organisation, as ours is too, yes, but one is overt and the other covert, which makes a big difference in terms of the mode of religious expression. Islam over here is overtly fascistic, and hence we are raising full-blooded fascist Muslims, as can be seen by the major role our highly educated alien spawn is now revealing in this news snippet. No better proof could be desired that by having Muslims in our society that are as British as I am, we are being transformed from a British society into an alien society by a rapid process of state sponsored infusion, like a dead organism becoming fossilised as stone supplants tissue, only worse than this, we are being transformed alive, and we are powerless to do the least thing about it because this is precisely what we evolved to do ! To form an ever greater superorganic being. I like to say this is because our masters are aliens, which is true, but I

have to let the science have full play, and this means that the superorganism being now global in its extent, it is driving all parts of the world toward this horrific outcome where Jews rule a world that is uniformly Islamic, with Christians as a middle order of organisation. Islam is the identity befitting global unification because of its ideological structure which negates all localised differences and such like nuances of slave maker programming to do with emphasising individuality, and after the establishment of Israel this is what the war of global jihad means, and in ISIS we get to see how it appears in life. These people are openly committing horrific acts against all who are not Muslim, and approved of, and this is said to be a tactic to aid their military advance, which is said to be working as populations flee in terror before them, including the Iraq army that left all its American supplied state-of-the-art hardware behind in the process ! You could not make it up. However, from a scientific perspective that understands that this is a biological process of growth driven by the impress of linguistic force upon human biomasses, this brutality looks like a deliberate act of ideological expression befitting who and what they are, and profess to be, as in the arch enemies of the West. Muslim fascists give the root ideology banning images and female display and such like, by denouncing music and bombing bars where people were watching this years World Cup football matches, and by acting with vicious brutality towards defenceless women and children and all, they are attacking the very core of Western ideological beliefs which proclaim superiority based on the highest values of love and humanity. This brutality is too obviously a direct denunciation of these core values of our dominant world with its pompous pretence of international law, and laws against war crimes, that of course only apply to powerless goofs, and never mention Jews in Israel or ex British prime ministers like Tony Blair. I agree with such a show of contempt for our values, they are a sham, a device employed to render us easily manipulated, like domestic cattle, and that is what these soldiers of global Judaism could be telling us, if we knew how to listen, but of course not a word of this mode of reasoning has been given in any public analyses, even if those who ought to of twigged to this as I have, know it as I do.

Globalisation is a process, not a plan followed by our masters. Muslims were brought here on mass, and continue to be, to be forced like a cultural wedge into our society with a clear intention to transform our society into a new global constitution in conformity with Judaism, but while key aspects of globalisation based on Judaism are akin to a political act of deliberate globalisation, the process is nonetheless an expression of our biological human corporate nature. And this is seen in the management of information as seen in this news crafting where an ideological Muslim act of horror, setting Islam against Western culture, is given a mundane explanation while the obvious ideological truth is left unsaid, so that the arrow of Islamification i. e. the face of globalisation – is allowed to penetrate onward in its journey, unimpeded by threats to its progress – this is how Judaism works at all levels of its identification, by which we mean as other identity formulas, Christianity, Islam, Nazism, ISIS, and so on.

Wednesday, 16 September 2015 – I need to update my ideas expressed in the above passage. Somehow my views on the nature of our society have undergone a change over the last year, one that is consistent with my overall thinking, but with a subtle change of some importance. In the above we see my old way of thinking about Western culture as something shifting toward the secular end of the conceptual spectrum, which is the official position we often hear spoken of in terms of society becoming more secular and less religious. It has been a long standing idea in my work that all that is nonreligious exists in subservience to religion, so that science exists to protect religion from science, as modern, rampant atheism, does likewise, protecting religion from atheism. These dynamics I have often spoken of. But for some reason the obvious reality has only recently occurred to me, being prompted, I think, by

recent political dynamics concerning the threat posed to Europe by immigrants, and also a few nudges offered by the rise of socialism under the sudden, surprising events of the Labour leadership contest, that ended last Saturday and put Jeremy Corbyn at the head.

I have long employed the idea that there can only be one message, which may appear in a multitude of forms that must all say the same thing, but thus far I have only teased out the uniformity concerning the primacy of the individual, within that message as it now exists, to a nominal extent, recognising that this identity component exists. From recent political dynamics I have suddenly recognised that our secular values, so called, are in fact simply religious values set adrift from the religious creed. How can I of missed this idea, it is so obvious ! Indeed, in some recent purchases dealing with atheism there are statements about atheism coming in various religious forms ! Which amounts to what I have just said applies to all our secular values. Not the book I have in mind, but *Religion for Atheists* by Alain de Botton, 2012, is based on the idea that secular society should retain the spiritual content of religion despite rejecting the actual religion itself ! Too crazy. (see p. 14 for example.)

We do better to speak of a family of atheisms, rather than a single, holy, catholic and apostolic atheism.

(*Atheists : The Origin of the Species*, Nick Spencer, 2014, p. xviii.)

This is where the case is stated for various religious creeds throwing up various modes of atheism. A quote at the front of the book talks about atheism being a “variety of Christianity”. Spencer acknowledges his colleagues at Theos, which is a Christian think tank, so this is a book about atheism written by a religious propagandist, but the point about atheism being a mode of religious expression is nonetheless well made here.

So, there it is, the fact that we find ourselves made prone to the ingress of Islam on mass, on the basis of sentimental drivel about the need to help refugees, brings home the reality that the ideology employed in this secular context is pure, unadulterated, Christian religious slave ideology. Which makes perfect sense. But it is only at times like this, when we are faced with a dilemma that forces our masters to come out of hiding from their role of Jewish slave priests, and openly denounce our political masters in power for falling back upon natural defensive positions in response to the feelings of their resident populations, that this simple, obvious truth, is made plainly visible. Thus secular society and its so called liberal values, are Christian slave values without the overt religious attachment of dogma and validation. And this fact finally gives us a means of making sense of the fact that our leaders are always devoutly, fanatically, religious, indicating that they consciously evince Christian slave values in their secular deliveries with a feeling of total belief, not caring at such times whether any religious content is delivered, only caring that the religious formula is followed. The supremacy of the individual we have long recognised as a core aspect of religion transposed to all other fields of thinking, but here we see that all other fields of thinking are in fact, on mass, a formulation based upon this principle of Christian slave ideology that makes the social mass prone to the requirements of Jewish master race ideology, that delivers the superorganic form capable of incorporating all humanity under one uniform identity, known my a myriad of names.

With this recent onslaught of Muslim migrants we see a prediction of Atheist Science being validated, concerning the fact that the process of world war that set the scene for Islam to enter Europe, was a preparation for the Islamification of Europe to make it a solidly Jewish slave biomass in millennia to come. Everything is going smoothly, precisely according to plan, as set out in ancient Jewish scriptures and enacted throughout our history.

In the above written a little over a year ago, I speak of the process of social transformation toward secular, liberal values, forcing Christianity to moderate its dogmatic position, even to the point of accepting same sex marriage recently. But now I am of another mind on this point, seeing every detail of our secular and liberal ideas as a perfect representation of Jewish slave values, rendered into Christianity. This makes perfect sense when one considers how an atheist like myself feels about homosexual marriage, which is not very good. The source of my discomfort is not the homosexual bit of this arrangement, but the marriage part. In other words what this apparent decimation of Christian values really does, is to extend religion across the biomass, reinforcing and invigorating Christianity, the exact opposite of undermining it, by *incorporating* secularism. But this act of incorporation is such a slow process, taking generations, that it can be misrepresented as a form of progress identified as 'secularisation', when it is not really anything of the kind, which gives us some notion of exactly how a religion of the Jewish kind evolves biologically, over time, at the behest of human biological corporate nature, driven by linguistic force. When our world becomes secular we do not find the falling away of the slave values of Christian dogma that are essential to the Jewish superorganism, such as the sanctity of life, not a bit of it, that emotional trigger remains as solid as ever. And the reason this is so has to do with the practical effect of a social structure being developed on these slave principles during millennia of extensive and intense material development. Thus people are alive only because of such principles and critical, instinctive cultural imperatives, such as the sacredness of the child as an innocent, are solidly ingrained into our *secular* culture. An excellent example of this particular fact was seen in the recent unfolding of the immigrant crisis along the eastern borders of Europe, today being Thursday, 17 September 2015. Much antagonism had been shown to the wave of immigrants pouring towards Europe from war torn Syria and other disturbed places, and our prime minister, Cameron, had declined to take any of these asylum seekers. Then the press got hold of one simple, routine event, in this context, the lifeless corpse of a young boy being fished out of the sea, which they worked up into a major story with all their usual finesse at such emotional stuff. It was not long before our stalwart prime minister relented and announced the thousands of Syrian refugees that we would be welcoming to Britain. This insignificant, routine incident, was then on all commentators lips as a message to us all to show pity, and be open to these criminals invading our land with supreme arrogance, and bringing with them the terrible disease of Islam, something much, much worse than Nazism could ever of been. And this is how a modern society like ours works, exactly as any society of humans has no doubt worked since the dawn of their existence a 150,000 years ago, on a pure, unmitigated, emotional basis, without any expression of reason whatsoever.

### **Recent Purchases - Wednesday, 30 September 2015**

Since being forced off the dole and into work nearly two years ago, my philosophising has come to a sudden end, I can do no reading and no writing, to speak of. What I have continued to do is to produce this one piece of work on Musolff, and occasionally I have bought a few books, with the ones just noted above as an example of recent purchases arising from a search of the main online book site. Another book I want to take notice of while I am here, is *Big Gods : How Religion Transformed Cooperation and Conflict* by Ara Norenzayan, 2013.

On the whole, there are today nearly 2 billion self-proclaimed Christians. Islam, with 1.3 billion people, is thriving too, and fundamentalist strains are making fresh inroads into all three Abrahamic faiths. Christian fundamentalism in particular is spreading like wildfire in places like China and Southeast Asia, and most of all, in sub-Saharan Africa. The United States—the world’s most economically powerful society and a scientifically advanced one—is also, anomalously, one of the most religious. Over 90 percent of Americans believe in God, 93 percent and 85 percent believe in heaven and hell, respectively, and close to one in two Americans believe in a literal interpretation of Genesis. These facts and figures point to our first observation about religious evolution : despite many predictions of religion’s demise in the last 200 years, most people in most societies in the world still are, and have always been, deeply religious.

The second observation about religious evolution is equally important : religions have always been multiplying, growing, and mutating at a brisk pace. In one estimate, new religions sprout at an average rate of two to three per day. “Many are called, but few are chosen,” says the Gospel according to Matthew (12:14). This “Matthew Effect” might as well refer to the iron law of religious evolution, which dictates that while legions of new religious elements are created, most of them die out, save a potent few that endure and flourish.

By one estimate, there are 10,000 religions in the world today. Yet, the vast majority of humanity adheres to a disproportionate few of them : just a handful of religions claim the vast majority of religious minds in the world. This is the third observation that flows from the first two: that most religious people living on the planet today are the cultural descendants of just a few outlier religious movements that won in the cultural marketplace. In the long run, almost all religious movements end in failure. Anthropologist Richard Sosis looked at the group survival rates of a representative set of 200 nineteenth-century Utopian communities, both religious and secular. He found a striking but overwhelming pattern. The average life span of the religious communes was a mere 15 years. In 80 years, nine out of ten religious communes had disbanded. Secular communes (mostly socialist) fared even worse : they lasted for an average of 6.4 years, and nine out of ten disappeared in less than 10 years.

This cultural winnowing of religions over time is evident throughout history and is occurring every day. It is easy to miss this dynamic process, because the enduring religious movements are all that we often see in the present. However, this would be an error. It is called *survivor bias*. When groups, entities, or persons undergo a process of competition and selective retention, we see abundant cases of those that “survived” the competition process ; the cases that did not survive and flourish are buried in the dark recesses of the past, and are overlooked. To understand how religions propagate, we of course want to put the successful religions under the microscope ; but we do not want to forget the unsuccessful ones that did not make it —the reasons for their failures can be equally instructive.

(Norenzayan, pp. 2 – 3.)

The first thing to say about this passage is that its principle feature is one of treating religion in isolation, as opposed to treating it as part of a wider process. This is a mode of individualism to a purpose, which, as with standard individualism defining the human person as an end in themselves, allows a narrow, bias focus, to deliver an entirely slanted idea of the subject in hand. So, when Norenzayan talks of religion thriving despite numerous predictions of its demise, he leaves the answer to this curious fact to be answered in terms of religion itself. Whereas, we would want to say that despite much talk of religion’s demise over recent



times, as with similar shallow prognostications about warfare, poverty, disease, money, and all sorts of other miserable aspects of our existence, these burdens have only gone from strength to strength. A subtle difference then, but one that is all important, because the only reason that religion persists is because of the biological process of social cleansing that scours the human biomass relentlessly, to remove anything antagonistic to religion, while leaving a clear path for religion to continue unhindered. A process of social cleansing in which these other eternal features of our existence play their part, hence they too are subject to denunciation without ever disappearing from our world. In contrast with this bias, political approach, based on the division and dissociation of facts in order to control knowledge, contrasting with the Atheist Science model that has all these facets of human social life operating as one, to deliver the wonderfully organised end that is the human animal, the superorganism, our Jewish society. We can sense the weight of Norenzayan's thought about to carry us along on a wave of enthusiasm for the resilience of this beloved possession, religion, that people will not relinquish, because they love it, need it, and know of its truth and value. This bias view is the fruit of applying an individualistic, isolationist logic, to the facts.

The ensuing discussion of endurance among religions is perfect for our purposes, for this ceaseless creation cum winnowing effect is indeed the essence of the argument employed in Atheist Science to explain the domination of one religion over all others today, whereby we are all now rendered Jewish, albeit by a myriad of different names. Again, we see the bias mode of expression being employed to guide the argument along a desired track, as he says "new religious elements are created, most of them die out, save a potent few that endure and flourish", thus invoking a process of individualistic natural selection which leaves the way open to make the dominance of Judaism a product of its inherent superiority. The fact that Darwinism lends itself to this promotion of religion in naturalistic terms, is evidence that Darwinism is an adjunct of religion itself, formed to ensure science exists to serve religion. This is the idea of social cleansing as a biosocial process, made self-evident, as science is cleansed of its true essence, its material body of facts being taken over by the mythological pattern informing the religious model of existence to make science part of the social body modelled on Judaism.

And again, the continuing argument is one based upon an undisclosed assumption of discrete, individual existence, in keeping with the way people think of their identities in everyday life. By contrast our argument says that the domination of major religions negates any difference, and this obvious fact is proven by the two main religions, Christianity and Islam, being blatantly subidentities of Judaism. But this man has no intention of trying to treat these human factors as naturalistic phenomenon acting according to a process that has nothing to do with how people understand that process in their daily lives.

How farcical is the priestly technique of knowledge manipulation seen here in the creation of a term for this bullshit anthropology, "survivor bias" !! Yeah, right, who the hell says this is what this phenomenon is called ? It has a regular name that needs no alternative for the purpose of a general description, 'social cleansing', and in Jewish mythology it is recognised in 'the chosen', as a demonstration of the incorporation of a strategy of linguistic force to make a social form the centre of this process occurring in the wider social context of civilised social structure.

---

Another point to pick up from Botton concerns the way he argues that our individuality is under threat and diminishing, while still being something absolute and real, instead of recognising that the reality is, that there is no such thing as an individual, as in the

human person. This is a typical piece of weasel philosophising, reminiscent of the eternal religious complaint that religion is under threat and must be defended by waging war on those forces that oppose it. So that in Botton's case, we find the rise of a global biomass of humans and the associated capitalist system, are the rogues destroying our individuality, because these 'forces' have no use for that personal attribute of our existence. The man is a complete idiot, or, more particularly, just a regular priest practising his priestcraft of nurturing the robotic biomass. He is an 'idiot', of course, it is simply that he has no notion of the issue. To question the reality of our individuality, for a leading intellectual of our time, is as ridiculous as questioning our physical existence, it is beyond question, a none question. Least ways, I have never seen the subject considered by any modern thinker of any kind, although it was a big topic in the days when we all knew that the human animal was a superorganism, as in when the idea of the social organism was commonly known. The subject is raised frequently, but not in the context of asserting it or treating it as plausible, but rather in the manner we see here, as a doubt we experience, so that we must explain the feeling of not existing, and not ponder the possibility of it being the reality of our nature as individual beings. This reality is not difficult for us to bear, not at all, but it makes religion impossible to sustain, for it is the disconnection of our awareness of our true nature from the object of superorganic being, that leaves the void that is filled by religion, by Judaism. This is why we are denied the truth about ourselves by these priests, who benefit thereby in terms of their status within the structure. When we see different sections of society being ushered from the fringes into the main stream, as happens continuously in our society, the reason this flux remains a permanent feature of our world is in order to allow the motivation to promote the same core message to be rewarded by being granted the privileges of higher status. This can be seen as the ongoing, constructive part of the social cleansing process, the new phase of integration taking place following the cleansing of the old established structure of the human biomass. Hence women may be drawn into the power structure, but only to become stalwart bastions of its ongoing authority, just as the dispossessed working man likewise moves from abject powerlessness to absolute power exercised in the name of Judaism, to give power its ultimate basis within our superorganism. It is interesting to see how those who speak on this topic invariably say these newly empowered, former dispossessed, bring a new factor of unity to the exercise of power, but all that changes is superficial, the core exercise of power remains as unchanged, and unchanging, as ever. Inequality continues unabated, ignorance, personified in religion, exploitation, warfare, the newcomers, history demonstrates, regarding these core 'values', is often worse than anything gone before, take Thatcher ; Blair ! And of course, any new social bodies are immediately penetrated by religious individuals who perform the task of subverting them to the service of religion, laws even being passed forcing political parties to include these enemies of the new bodies own revolutionary values.

On Newsnight last night, 07/10/2015, a discussion was had on the Islamification of Britain after some right wing Christian commentator, Peter Hitchens, often on TV, had published an article about a women wearing a hijab on the British Bake Off show on BBC 1, saying having these women on TV is political correctness. This man spoke of how British culture is long dead, having become part of multiculturalism, and the Muslim subversion of our society is well in hand. Nice to see such remarks being made, but the black women attacking him sat calm and smug, demonstrating the truth of these last yelps of our culture's death throws. She spoke of how we should all celebrate this obscenity, and Hitchens responded by saying "Are we all to be of one opinion on this ?"

### *i. Meeting Strangers*

1.

One of the losses modern society feels most keenly is that of a sense of community. We tend to imagine that there once existed a degree of neighbourliness which has been replaced by ruthless anonymity, a state where people pursue contact with one another primarily for restricted, individualistic ends: for financial gain, social advancement or romantic love.

Some of our nostalgia centres around our reluctance to give charitably to others in distress, but we are as likely to be concerned with pettier symptoms of social separation, our failure to say hello to one another in the street, for instance, or to help elderly neighbours with the shopping. Living in gargantuan cities, we tend to be imprisoned within tribal ghettos based on education, class and profession and may come to view the rest of humanity as an enemy rather than as a sympathetic collective we would aspire to join. It can be extraordinary and odd to start an impromptu conversation with an unknown person in a public space. Once we are past the age of thirty, it is even somewhat surprising to make a new friend.

In attempting to understand what could have eroded our sense of community, an important role has traditionally been accorded to the privatization of religious belief that occurred in Europe and the United States in the nineteenth century. Historians have suggested that we began to disregard our neighbours at around the same time as we ceased communally to honour our gods. This begs the question of what religions might have done, prior to that time, to enhance the spirit of community, and, more practically, whether secular society could ever recover this spirit without relying on the theological superstructure with which it was once entwined. Could it be possible to reclaim a sense of community without having to base it on religious foundations ?

2.

If we examine the causes of modern alienation in more detail, some of our sense of loneliness comes down to sheer numbers. The billions of people who live on the planet make the idea of talking to a stranger more threatening than it was in sparser days, because sociability seems to bear an inverse relationship to the density of population. We generally talk gladly to people only once we also have the option of avoiding them altogether. Whereas the Bedouin whose tent surveys a hundred kilometres of desolate sand has the psychological wherewithal to offer each stranger a warm welcome, his urban contemporaries, though at heart no less well meaning or generous, must - in order to preserve a modicum of inner serenity - give no sign of even noticing the millions of humans who are eating, sleeping, arguing, copulating and dying only centimetres away from them on all sides.

Then, too, there is the matter of how we are introduced. The public spaces in which we typically encounter others — the commuter trains, the jostling pavements, the airport concourses - conspire to project a demeaning picture of our identities, which undermines our capacity to hold on to the idea that every person is necessarily the centre of a complex and precious

individuality. It can be hard to stay hopeful about human nature after a walk down Oxford Street or a transfer at O'Hare.

We used to feel more connected to our neighbours in part because they were also often our colleagues. Home was not always an anonymous dormitory to be reached late and left early. Neighbours became well acquainted not so much because they were adept conversationalists, but because they had to bring in the hay or put up the school roof together, such projects naturally and surreptitiously helping to foster connections. However, capitalism has little patience for local production and cottage industry. It may even prefer it if we have no contact with our neighbours at all, lest they detain us on our way to the office or discourage us from completing an online acquisition.

(Botton, pp. 23 – 26.)

The opening paragraph is in effect saying that our cultural programming asserts our individuality, our existence as ends in ourselves, hence this belief we have, and indeed attitude we enact, of serving ourselves with an at least verbal acknowledgement of its correctness from society. But this selfishness is only an effect of our programming, and underneath this cultural colour, or shimmer, the reality is the same as ever, as made by nature, we do not exist, except as nature makes us, within which our cultural formation is included.

Note the ultra individualism introduced subliminally here, when saying “aspire to join”, delivered in a most normal manner that we would never notice unless we had come to understand that we do not exist as objects independent of the ‘collective’.

These remarks on the possible value of religion as a socialising medium emphasise the need to define the human animal as the individual person, as this allows religion to be linked to the social structure while simultaneously not being made an integral part of that same structure, allowing it to be defined as a by-product of our social life that we have been able to choose to dismiss, but at what cost ? This is all utterly contrived in obedience to the false pivot of individuality, and it entirely perverts the true biological function of religion as an expression of linguistic force creating the social structure. Added to which, who in their right mind could see religion as less dominant in our society today than in Victorian times ! Hell, we are fighting wars all around the world in the name of religion and imposing vicious laws attacking individual freedom in order to ensure the supremacy of those who assert a religious ideology, Islamophobia being one of the most serious crimes a normal person can commit in Britain today, being made akin to racism, a hate crime. Yes there is the charade of secularisation, but it is obviously a charade, as meanwhile we have the state moving heaven and earth to increase religious schools to force people to become religious, while dragging millions of Muslims, and Catholics from Poland and the like, into our society to ensure our atheist culture is nullified.

See how he has the creating of social structure “surreptitiously helping to foster connections” leading to this outcome, no greater bias toward ultra individualism can exist than this, it is a complete sham logic coming from this Jewish priest whose elite position in the media delivering our message of identity gives him immense power to tell us what we should think, a power used to serve the Jewish superorganism, albeit Botton is completely oblivious to this fact and merely follows the programme running in his brain.

—

My latest acquisition that we must mention is a slim paperback costing over fifty quid ! But what a book !! *A Theory of the Collective Social Organism* by Gil Maduro, 2011,

based on a thesis from 2002. It is not as good as the title makes it sound, of course, but it is impressive from our point of view, arguing as it does that society acts as if it were an organic entity it cannot help but lend evidence to the true position adopted in our Atheist Science. The author is careful to avoid any such suggestion however, naturally, he is a professional priest, of secular denomination, he adheres to the secular mantra of ultra individualism, which goes unspoken, even when writing a work as contrary to this fiction as can be.

Sunday, 11 October 2015

Back home at last ! It has been a long week in Hull, doors flying off hinges and an ongoing wave of abusive attitude, as in endlessly seeking to make use of me to serve his ends, coming from the little dear I support. But also, a great big library book sell off, where I spent twenty quid on some ten books, some of which titles I'll list now, because they are a delight to come across in this unexpected way :

*God : An Itinerary*, Régis Debray, French 2001, translation 2004.

*Deceit and Self-Deception : Fooling Yourself the Better to Fool Others*, Robert Trivers, 2011.

*Darwin's Sacred Cause : Race, Slavery and the Quest for Human Origins*, Adrian Desmond and James Moore, 2009.

*Decoding Reality : The Universe as Quantum Information*, Vlatko Vedral, 2010. Linking this to Maduro's work mentioned above makes a powerful argument for the core principle of Atheist Science, as embodied in the idea of linguistic force creating superorganic form, this book is what I have set myself to read now, and I may put my notes online the same as I am doing here with Musolff, as this looks like an important book for our purposes.

*A World Full of Gods : Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Roman Empire*, Keith Hopkins, 1999.

*Darwin's Plots : Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, Gillian Beer, 1983.

*Denialism : How Irrational Thinking Hinders Scientific Progress, Harms the Planet, and Threatens our Lives*, Michael Specter, 2009.

*The Celtic Cross : An Illustrated History and Celebration*, Nigel Pennick, 1997.

*The Last Lingua Franca : English Until the Return of Babel*, Nicholas Ostler, 2010.

Now is that a clutch of books or what ! Quit a clutch I would say, there is all sorts here, much that is of use in our eternal quest to pursue the subversion of truth in order to preserve the living being we are part of.

This morning, 11/10/2015, I sent this to Specter :

Scientists are the biggest denialists of all, and I am certain you are as big a denialist as any. What if I said there is no such thing as science, that science only exists to serve religion. Does such an idea fascinate you, or do you act with automatic revulsion against yet another lunatic statement from the cohort of irrationalists ? The framework for you to reject such statements is there and I am certain it controls your mind, as it does everyone else's, otherwise you could not write so sublimely of science as a perfect thing, when science as a way of knowing does not even exist in conformity to the ideal it pretends to obey.

You talk of the "rigorous and open-minded scepticism of science compared to the inflexible certainty of ideological commitment."

I have never met anyone more rigid and closed minded than a professionally trained scientist. To allow a layman to make a scientific statement contradicting official science is unthinkable to a scientist, who acts as if the system of knowledge creation they are part of is supreme, and perfect, when the slightest look around would tell the biggest idiot, this cannot be so, for our world is run by ideas that are as patently false, as false can be.

On p. 218 you flaunt the scientific ideal of not flinching at any truth, believing as a matter of principle that to know must always be better than to deny to a purpose.

Well then, lets put you to the test. I'll reveal to you a simple scientific fact, quite undeniable from a scientific point of view, utterly obvious, as science, but a fact that science works tirelessly to suppress, and lets see if you can accept this simple scientific truth.

The human animal is a superorganism, like an insect superorganism, so that the individual person, you and me, does not exist, as an end in themselves. Individuals are not animals, in their own right, they are animal, but not animals. Our power of speech alone proves this without any possibility of equivocation. If science acknowledged this fact then religion would be rendered impossible, and the being of the living animal we are part of would be destroyed. So, science no longer tolerates this truth, although it once did, until the first world war. Well, are you a denialist, or a truth seeker ? Ask yourself if you are happy to accept this fact I have revealed, if it be a fact, or if you have no interest in even considering such an idea because it has not come from the font of authority.

11/10/2015

And to Trivers :

I just came across your Deceit in a library book sale, I wanted to point out that yours is the ultimate self deception, but I see from your website that things are a whole lot worse than indicated by your book, as you have devoted yourself as a biologist, to the nature of human society. You have everything entirely arse about face, this is so obvious, yet you deliberately set your face against the simple scientific truth. So much so, that it suggests you are doing this consciously, in the same way someone would support religion while knowing it is utter nonsense, for reasons to do with their status in the social order. As I always say, scientists are just priests delivering the religious message in a parallel form to that of religious myth. What to say to a man who knowingly rejects genuine science for false science ? The fact remains that what is, is, and although you may deliberately reject the correct science that made society the biological form, and the individual nonexistent as an end in themselves, you are still a product of the true organicist model. You are famous and successful because you have devoted yourself to false science, science in the service of religion, serving religion by filling the void that a genuine science based on the corporate nature of our species, would occupy if it were allowed to exist. So although you may not be labouring under a weight of self-deception, you are nonetheless forced to act as if you were, there is no escape from the fact that you do not exist, as an end in yourself, so in order to attain high status you have been forced to devote your entire life to false science, like a person devoting themselves to false knowledge of a religious kind, it is a common thing, we do it because we do not exist as animals in our own right, as ends in ourselves. The human animal is a superorganism, not a person, we individuals are not animals, we are animal, but not animals in ourselves.

Damn, forgot to add my name, sent 11/10/2015 16:50.

I was lining up to send something to Desmond, but I may skip this missive. I like to fire off a response to the authors whose works I hit upon, though I never get a response,

except for one, a month or two back, from Barnes, *City as Superorganism*, but I soon put a stop to that nonsense, apparently, my reply has not been answered. Everyone is terrified of offending religion these days, no one would dare associate with an atheist, a real one that is, not the type conjured up by the establishment to serve religion under the name of atheism that is let lose today.

I read Desmond's *Politics of Evolution* about a decade ago and loved it for the way it showed Darwin to be an establishment man, providing the background for arguing that he was nurtured by the system to be brought forward as the man of science offering an acceptable theory of evolution that put man at the centre of the process. This later work is very much of the kind that serves religion, making Darwin out to be a man guided by religious ideals in his formulation of his theory of natural selection because he believed in the one species idea, where others were arguing that a number of human species existed, making blacks a separate type of human animal from whites, for example. This argument does still serve the same logic of indicating that Darwin's first principle was not unbiased science above all else, but it certainly looks like a very different kind of work, one serving religion not intellectual integrity.

Mentioning the question of natural selection serving to place humans at the centre of the cosmos perceived in terms of biological evolution, we have a delightful book in *Darwin's Plots*, because here Beer mentions that all ideologies prior to Darwin had ensured man's hallowed place at the centre of things. I have not studied the passage, or marked it, but I assume she is going to say Darwin broke with this by delivering an unbiased scientific account of humanity that made us out to be but a mere animal, like any other, as far as nature is concerned. But nothing could be farther from the truth and Beer does us a service by making the point that all primary ideologies must put human at the centre in some form, either by making the planet the centre of the cosmos when religion was projected onto the heavens, or by making the individual that centre of the process of evolution now that religion is projected onto nature, as in the nature of existence, by making God the being that created nature, and therefore made humans as the pinnacle of that natural creation. This is how Darwin denies humans their natural place in existence, by making the individual the unit of evolution. And we see this point emphasised in Trivers work where he expressly sets out to build a naturalistic account of society based upon the biological evolution of the human individual !

And then would you bloody credit it :

Reply from Trivers :

```
fuck yourself
you are full of shit start to finish

and i will never read a message again knowing that it came from an a..h...
like you
```

then :

```
this has nothing to do with you of course but for some reason i inspire an
abusive message like the one below every two months or so-of course i tell
him to f... himself that he is full of shit and an a..h... and that i will
read no message from him again, but still curious to me how i set of these
organisms in the first place
```

```
on the positive side, heart attack is best thing that has happened to me
in a long time, i am much healthier, look much better-people who don't
even know of the heart attack tell me with surprise how colorful my face
is-yes i think to myself it is actually getting some oxygen for a change
```

```
hope to see you soon enough
```

```
all best
```



Sounds about right, I would not expect anything less from such a degenerate priest. I sent this, 12/10/2015 09:19 :

Thank you for the reply, sorry to hear of your ill health, but lets stick to the science shall we. I intended no abuse, the email medium allows no finesse, I consider it to be perfectly obvious that the human animal is a superorganism and on p308 you refer to the time when this was accepted, so you know of this idea. Why would any scientist want to suggest that the individual person is the object of human evolution ? It must be obvious this is not so, our power of speech alone demonstrates this, and the absurd product it delivers that rules our world, as in religion. You are the abusive one ? But I do not mind, it shows what kind of attitude you have, and I find this in all professional scientists, pure arrogance for their false bullshit from which they get a good living. I repeat, with no offence intended, you are the one labouring under the grossest self-deception.

Yours, Howard Hill

Talk about speaking too soon.

## The Reading

I began reading *Metaphor, Nation and the Holocaust*, 2010, by Andreas Musolff, on April 13, 2014, the following is a transcript of the notes made at the time of reading, separated from comments added afterwards during transcription, and any future reviewing, by a short underline. My usual practice is to transcribe my notes as they were written and then to make any added comments as I see fit, rather than editing notes made when reading, just to keep these true, as a first, immediate impression, and something distinct from a developing piece of work that would be written in a normal prose style.

---

**Page 1** Instantly conflates the idea of society as a living, biological entity/being – *i.e.* social organism – with the individual somatic form. This he relates to the Nazi era idea of a corporate social body to which people belong, but this is a gross error that deliberately imposes the seventeenth century ruse of Hobbes that did equate the social body to an individual somatic body, but this absolutely is not what anyone meant by the nineteenth century organicist model of social life. This is why Spencer spoke in analogically functional terms about social structure equating to bodily structure, as in telegraph line equalling nerves. This *failure* is infuriating because right from the off we see the disingenuousness of this author. Yet everywhere the references Musolff supplies to a ‘body politic’, are only concerned with the somatic analogy – nowhere does anyone he identifies resurrect the real issue of the time, as in society as an organism. The problem here is that this historical idea, of the somatic comparison with society, is imposed upon the recent use of its equivalent in the nineteenth century, where the somatic form never appeared at all, while the real idea that did appear and did inform Nazi ideology, and is now banished as a result, is never discussed. Making this focus upon the ‘body politic’ look like a new trick in the ongoing effort of academia to serve as a religious priesthood by cleansing the truth of history, in this case, by conflating prescientific ideas with scientific equivalents. So it seems in reading Musolff this act of conflation is the key expression of the priestcraft for us to look out for.

---

One of the early works I found in the first years after hitting upon the true idea of human nature as being that of a superorganism, that came to me via the field of political science, led me to a German nineteenth century author called Gierke. His interest lay in the history of natural law, and in this regard he drew on the history of ideas that reached back to Hobbes, and treated the King as a body like that of a person. Therefore the Hobbesian somatic based comparison, was featured in some studies from this period. But this was not an idea coming to life again in this form. The only sense in which society was compared with a living entity in the nineteenth century, was in the entirely new form of the social organism, which is entirely removed from the earlier somatic based ideas. Although, once again, we must admit that organicist works of the period, Lilienfeld to identify one such author, were happy to relate the contemporary use of the sociological comparison of the day to the same precursors Musolff identifies. Hence, though we now qualify this first note above, its main statement on this subject still stands : the idea of society being treated as a

person, did not, to all intents and purposes, exist *at all*, in the nineteenth century. It was not a living idea at this time, although it was recognised as an historical idea that bore some superficial relationship to the newly emerged comparison known under the phrase ‘social organism’.

**Page 2**        Straightaway then we see the difference between the Nazi politicisation of science which Musolff is so happy to run with, thus serving Judaism as Hitler likewise served Judaism. Therein lies the key to the somatic analogy’s acceptability as an allusion to scientific ideas revealing society to be a biological phenomenon. By making the false idea of the individual the model of society as a biological form, the false idea is projected from the person to the collective, with all the positive consequences for the Jews as master race. This of course is how the Nazis were created by linguistic force to express science in a political form, and thereby bring science into disrepute, and create the Hitler Taboo which Musolff is presenting a study of here, without acknowledging it as such, and therefore extending the taboo by keeping its existence covert. This work therefore serves as an excellent example of the reality of the false pivot of observation serving as the hub of logic from which to weave a tapestry of false knowledge that is logically consistent and deals with every detail of reality, but delivers knowledge in a political form, as multifaceted reality, where all there is is a single unified object, the human being as a superorganism.

---

The triumphal blabbering about the Nazi hatred of Jews is truly pathetic, pretending he has found a proof of this hatred otherwise put in doubt by Nazi apologists, this suggests the nature of this work is to be a mindlessly Judophilic antisemitism diatribe of the prolific house of Judaism machinery, that we might call a Hitler Taboo industry, in recognition of the term already long established that identifies the tiresome production of works about the holocaust, milking the *tragic* history for all it is worth. The Hitler Taboo is not recognised by anyone other than myself of course, for this requires adopting the true pivot of observation that has the human animal as a superorganism. When rare comments have suggested the tragedy of Judaism under Nazism was a boon to the Jews (UKIP candidate in 2013.), they have done so on the same individualist basis as the Nazis, and thus extended the taboo from within – i.e. triggered it (inducing a vitriolic reaction and outcry of antisemitism), as opposed to employing it to understand humanity in relation to this topic.

---

He then gives us four questions, answering which forms the basis of this book. However, as his argument is as inherently flawed as a religious treatise assuming divinity before all else, there is no hope of any sense being spoken here.

1) Firstly he asks how a Hobbesian analogy can generate the idea of distinct cultural identities being in competition with one another ! The inanity of the man is galling. Since we began by saying the organicist logic informing Nazism was of a more modern, biological, scientific kind, this question is a nonstarter. Had Musolff actually used the famous ‘analogy’ of the social organism that really informed Nazi logic he would of seen straightaway that the real mystery is how come science did not get there first ! This of course has been my complaint all along, why did all those people utilising the idea of the social organism never apply its logic in a scientific manner, thereby revealing the Jewish identity to be the master identity and all humanity to be enslaved to it – as is so obviously the case ? But that is precisely where the Nazis came in, to snuff out this obvious scientific truth that had been supplanted and thereby constrained, but which still needed the one mechanism of human superorganic physiology that could really contain this simple fact – taboo. The idea had to be

made unspeakable and would you believe it, here we have a book on the very subject that conforms to this necessity, by sticking to the false pivot of individuality even though this means simply disregarding history that is so recent it includes my own grandfather's youth within its span.

The second question is padding, meaninglessness pretending to be meaningful, a conversational kind of ruse, feigning stupidity – a priestly game.

The next question is more tricky, a curious concoction of serious consideration, forced along the false trajectory dictated by the false pivot of individuality. Is the 'metaphor' racist because it implies purity of identity ?, is basically what he is saying. To wit the answer is obviously 'yes', but the premises are the source of the racism, not the principle. In other words the treatment of Jews as political entities – parasites – rather than anatomical structures – brain/seat of social identity – is a consequence of taking the broad outline of a social body and then giving it an individual form modelled on the nonexistent individual – person. As I have always said, my neutral description of the Jews as master identity is far more damaging than Hitler's equivalent, metaphorical description of them as parasites. Which is what makes Nazism an agent of Judaism, not an enemy.

Finally we could take his last question here as a forceful insistence upon the Hitler Taboo itself, demanding that anyone who invokes a genuine scientific model of humanity be deemed beyond the pale of society – the true culmination of Hitler's work. As we have always said, the crucial thing for our world is that true science should not exist – as it did in the first days of science's application to humans, and any number of world wars and holocausts are more than worth the price of ensuring this nonexistence of science should prevail. Look at the vile stupidity of the man, it is too disgusting. He is going to analyse how metaphor in politics acts on individuals – Ha! As if individuals were but robots that are programmed by language to do whatever their programmes want them to do, so that certain programmes must be deemed criminal. Yes, starting with Judaism – the true source of Nazism.

I love dealing with this man because his topic is spot on for my Atheist Science interest in human biological nature, but he is infuriating – as such people always are, with their carefully blinkered stupidity. The priests have provided the correct identification of society with an organism and so he treats this absurd position as correct, so we have a metaphor, not reality. His idea that Hitler saw the nature of the Jews he describes as real is actually fascinating, for this is a clue to our frequent complaint that this knowledge was imbued into sociological organicism but suppressed in academic form and hence it erupted in a political form instead – Nazis – and thus turned into a form of social scab – a taboo against reality. This penetrating explanation resolves the false paradox Musolff constructs here.

Lets ask a question of our own. If the modern organicist idea of society were true, would it be blithely accepted as such ? Like hell it would, and indeed from the off it was always resisted because in its modern scientific form its implications are instantly apparent to anyone. It denies the existence of the person. And this fact seethes within Musolff's book by virtue of the question of its validity never being considered – unless we consider this kind of pathetic subservience to whatever passes for usual an act of deeply thought out consideration. His book is really all about what humans are as natural objects, and hence what religion is, and what Jews are ? But he never even deigns to consider this, always taking the status quo as given, as what is right, even though his theme concerns an idea that totally contradicts this – his work is a typical example of history written by the victors – here the victors are the Jews (religion), and the vanquished are the people of the world (science).

**Page 3** So now the priest employs the tools of priestcraft openly described by himself, to try and erase any trace of the truth that his idea of a paradox just suggested. He is working hard to churn out this turgid stuff, definitely spent too long studying *Mein Kampf* by the look of it, Hitler seems to of subliminally infected his reasoning process. If he is going to say, as he does here, that the sole meaning of the organicist analogy was that of code for 'genocide', in Hitler's usage, then we need to know where this object of extermination came from to cause it to appear in such an elaborate form of disguise. His reasoning really is too facile. This because he has a bias object directing the form his argument takes, that of employing the taboo on behalf of the authority he mindlessly serves. OK, next paragraph he rejects the reasoning we just trashed.

---

When I speak of the origin of the 'object of extermination', as in the idea of genocide, I mean that this idea did have a rational basis relating directly to the Jews seen as parasites, exactly as we indicate by speaking of the Jews as the master race, bearers of the master identity that is the identity of the living human animal, the superorganism. And this knowledge of master race identity was always implicit in the idea of a social organism, which is why it was always shunned right from the first offering of it in English, by Herbert Spencer in his 1860 essay *The Social Organism*. Musolff is at pains to ensure that no such justification can be asserted, and that is why he speaks of this subject in the dismissive terms he does, and why he steers clear of any discussion of the organicism associated with the idea of the social organism, sticking instead to the irrelevant idea of the body politic.

**Page 4** Then he casually, fleetingly, considers whether the organicist idea was taken literally and denounces this as not possible for then it would simply have been seen as a 'grotesque' error ! Where does he get off denouncing what is obviously correct science in this way ? We are caused to ponder on the likes of Aristotle denouncing the lunacy of suggesting the earth is an object in motion ! Yeah, *as if*. What is delightful about his argument as it proceeds to make out an analysis of how social organicism supported antisemitism, is that he is actually telling us that this true science that ruled society at precisely the formative time of Nazi origins, did create the Nazis – which is perfect, because that is precisely what we say it did. Only he is still approaching from the seventeenth century idea of Hobbes rather than the nineteenth century idea of Spencer, Lilienfeld, Schäffle, Worms and many others of the organicist school of sociology.

---

I am slightly lost by my own notes, too cursory I suppose, in brackets I have put (Question marked sentence). The only such sentence here says :

So, if it was neither that [literally true] nor a lie, how can we describe its meaning . . . ?

Which sentence, must of been what I had especially in mind when I wrote the above comment on the dismissive way Musolff treats the Nazi use of the idea that society is a social organism, and how this lends itself to our Atheist Science ideas. This page is quite complex in terms of the stuff Musolff comes out with here, so referring my notes to it to know what I was thinking is a bit tricky, and this shows the trouble with this method of analysis by way of verbatim note replication page by page, rather than a running argument about the book's

contents selected specifically. However when we study a book that is so precisely suited to our interests, I feel this kind of detailed analysis is essential, and along the way the general discussion will reveal a full account of our argument about what the book under discussion is, and what our criticism is too, and we can still include precisely targeted criticisms of the text along the way.

---

#### Returning to my notes :

He identifies the Hitler Taboo but calls it an 'historical index', which is as nicely abstract as you can get for a – lets see, what did he call such evasive terms used by the Nazis ? Ah yes 'camouflage'. Here Musolff is building an extension of the Hitler Taboo and using intellectual 'camouflage' constructs to state the fact in a manner all initiates – academics – will understand, but no one else will, should they inadvertently stumble into the pages of his book – unless they find our decodification first.

---

We know religion is biological in its nature because it is an animal behaviour. Therefore we check if it is genetic and therefore somatic in nature, finding it is not, we ask what this biological phenomenon can possibly indicate, and the one solution is that the source of this biological phenomenon being social, the animal it belongs to consists of the social object religion belongs to, exists within, and emanates from. But no academic or anyone else has ever treated religion in this detached, abstract, scientific manner. All interpretations have always begun from the assumption of the person as the individual. As we never tire of saying because the priests never tire of replicating this *error*.

---

What a fantastic list of entirely new names dealing with sociological organicism we find here (see end notes), as hoped for but not really expected, they will all be priests, but it shows the power of the idea erupting under the pressure of linguistic force that is the key to understanding human processes.

---

**Page 5**      The 'belly' is new to me and sounds like a perfect precursor intuitive insight into the true biological nature of humans. Of course the whole idea of Judaism as a basis of superorganic being rests on the principle that it intuitively identifies the true biological corporate nature of humans, and transforms it into a linguistic genome of corporate identity with Judaism as the core identity, creating a master race identity and causing all humans to become Jews thereby. Hence the problem when science arrives and easily turns this intuitive development into a scientific model of human corporate being. So this long existing idea exists for a good reason, and has real scientific significance utterly beyond any priests comprehension of course, as we see here as Musolff displays the power of ignorance borne of highly trained intelligence, which is the basis of the core organ of human corporate being.

---

Day before yesterday, 9/07/2014, I posted a detailed history and discussion of the social organism as an edit to a Wikipedia page, in it I noted that Judaism will of been generated by the rise of cities as an embryonic form of a new kind of superorganism based on a purer linguistic identity, able to incorporate the race based corporate identity of the lower order of superorganic being supported by hunter gatherer economics. The latent potential of dissociated cities will of provided the potential for this development of a new, incorporating

identity formula, as the social body is the object created by linguistic force wherein such isolated social forms would naturally coalesce under the influence of linguistic force, as surely as mass does under that of gravitation. The invocation of a race based creed in the late nineteenth century, upon which the antisemitism of the Nazis was based, is a curious throwback to this pre-civilised era, making us wonder how this strategy emerged to defend religion at this point.

It would seem that the rise of sociological organicism threatening to uncloak the true nature of contemporary corporate identity seen in Jewish linguistic identity forms, prompted a defence that made religious thinkers become racists, as they strove to apply science in a manner that would divert science away from its true focus upon linguistically generated Judaism, forming the identity of a social organism. It would certainly of been illogical for scientists to of claimed the Jews were a race apart, or that races denoted distinct human species, this issue had already been settled by science in favour of all races being of one species, and one original stock. So it was a political, religious departure, that made the Jews into a race. And while Duhring may not say he was inspired to do so by Darwinism, those who followed in the same direction, eugenicists and Social Darwinists included, did recognise that Darwin was tailor made to serve a racial model of human types equating to species. This strategy led naturally to the identification of Jews as a distinct race, an otherwise insane idea, which eventually led to the culminating act of genocide that has sealed off the genuine science of human superorganic being, forever. I began reading Duhring's 1880 work forming the basis of Nazis racist antisemitism yesterday, and it gets straight into this idea of the Jews being another race, so much so they appear in his view to be tantamount to another species of human. Sadly he does not give us the basis of this coming to this conclusion, by way of what scientific arguments we wonder, was it Darwinism, or what ? This makes it hard for us to delve into the proposition that it was the rise of sociological organicism that pushed people to develop the race based interpretation of Judaism. According to Schuster, *Fortnightly Review*, 1881, Duhring was antagonistic to all religion, although my initial reading of Duhring's work convinced me it was a typical piece of Christian antisemitism, because he treasures Christianity.

**Page 6** Here we have a paragraph I've marked 'important' because it alludes to the truth, albeit in a deceitful way, for here Musolff, having noted that any plebe would understand the 'metaphor', nonetheless the use of it as a ruse to invoke Jewish genocide might tap into a collective knowledge of that era ! Exactly so – knowledge of the social organism that all knew at this time, which revealed the Jews to be the master race. Except Musolff sidesteps this historical fact by mining under history to surface at Hobbe's metaphorical use of the body simile, thus dodging the really dangerous Spencerian model of society as a true organism. I do not like using Spencer to identify this scientific model because he was so poor a representative, Comte crosses my mind as the first of a scientific school of sociology to use the phrase 'social organism', but for now we'll run with Spencer, he was the famous expert of the nineteenth century to whom others, seemingly, deferred for purposes of acknowledging the idea.

---

This 'important' paragraph is about the source of Nazi organicism informing their racism. I recently bought a copy of Duhring's work on the Jews which I started reading this week, today being Sunday, 13 July 2014, and it is a remarkable item in this context. With Duhring before us it seems unnecessary to look anywhere else for Hitler's antisemitism, it is all right there. The organicism is lacking, I have spotted a couple of organicist terms, but they are

fleeting inclusions that could mean nothing in terms of Duhring's views on the nature of society. The question then becomes where Duhring got his bizarre, extreme views on the Jews from ? I hit a most important passage yesterday where he specifically deals with the nature of Christianity as a Jewish ideology, where his contortions preserve the value of Christianity by separating it from Judaism, to leave Judaism isolated as a thing of ignominy. This indicates that his antisemitism was Christian in nature, and as such a defence of Judaism, rather than a true attack on Judaism, which would of resulted in a treatment of Christianity as one with Judaism. So this is extremely important in understanding where Hitler's identical approach came from, and what it signifies, which is that Nazi antisemitism was a contrivance designed from the off, in Duhring's time, as a defence serving Judaism. Without more information on where Duhring got his views from it is hard to explain why this antisemitism was constructed at this time as a protection for Jews, by setting them apart from Christians in the curious way Duhring contrives, using race, and Christianity as a Jewish reaction against the Jew's misanthropic racial traits. But it must be taken to be a product of the rise of science, and organicism would seem to be critical in this, so that what the Nazis added to Duhring was the organicist dimension. Hitler's organicism therefore seems to be the maturation of a movement set in train by Duhring.

The relevant passage on Christianity as an anti Jewish movement, begins on page seventy seven of *Eugen Duhring on the Jews* by Alexander Jacob, 1997. He describes Christianity as a reaction against Jewish innate nastiness, that was unable to triumph within Jewish hands, and only became the sublime idea of humanity that it is when it transcended Judaism. A more ludicrous interpretation of Christianity could not be imagined, when it is obvious that Christianity turns none Jews in slaves of Judaism, he even describes how Christianity has a slave mantra, yet still this does not give this astute man a clue about Christianity's true nature ! How can this be ? It is this impossible oversight that reveals that this contrivance was a *deliberate* effort to generate antisemitism to serve Judaism, that is what antisemitism does, so that is what this man must of been doing, but not necessarily consciously, but merely by following his cultural programming as a German Christian, even if he was an atheist.

Tuesday, 15 July 2014 – I spent sometime yesterday examining works by Duhring, what he wrote and what was available to buy, and the one that stands out for me as suggesting the impetus behind the rise of antisemitism that would culminate in Nazi ideology, is about Lessing as a Judophile. This work relates to the liberation of the Jews in European society that forms a key part of Duhring's exposition in the early pages of Jacob's rendition. This offers a possible clue to the rise of antisemitism at this time as being a reaction to the inversion of the centuries old dynamic between the primary structural elements of the Jewish superorganism, whereby the Jews were formerly kept strictly in place. It is as if antisemitism is a mechanism operating when Jews are unconstrained within the structure, setting up an alternative form of barrier/linkage between the master and its host, one far more flexible. Such an idea could be made to accord with the idea that linguistic force creates social structure so that when the laws containing the master organ are removed, another set of laws of an opposite nature take their place. We see the exact same dynamic operate with the legalisation of homosexual relations where we switch from prosecuting homosexuality, to prosecuting anyone who acts negatively toward homosexuality. It is a curious dynamic to get in perspective, but it seems to relate to the nature of minor groups within society, which begs the question as to their nature as organs of superorganic organisation, or being.



social form to this day, by sparking an anti-Nazi reaction to any far right voices who conversely still appeal to the ‘metaphor’.

---

Why are parasite analogies used ? To apply the taboo, unwittingly, just as Musolff unwittingly devotes years to the exact same project due to his nonexistent status as a slave unit of superorganic being identified by Judaism. The continuing use of rightwing ideas is due to our continuing enslavement to Judaism prompting reaction, which this Nazi formula resolved in favour of the Jews, and so it must now be continually invoked to quell the revulsion of the European biomass at its identity extermination by our master by reinvigorating religion, by infusing Islam into their (our master’s) European slave biomass.

---

Fabulous statement identifying 250 key works relating to sociological organicism – ace – where is the list ! This knowledge is what I have been striving after for a dozen years now, no wonder I keep finding new items to delight me – such as the last book I read, last summer (2013), *Bionomics* by Rothschild.

---

Of course from a scientific point of view the organicist model of society was indicated as the basis of Hitler’s ‘racist’ ideas, it being a direct political perversion of the science of society suppressed by Judaism.

---

Duhring calls the Jews a “parasite of a corruption” (p. 61) within German economic life, meaning they feed of a society in a corrupt state. He was an economist, amongst other things.

**Page 8** Closes his introduction by feeding us the assumption that genuine science leads to racism . . . and hence cannot be tolerated.

## Chapter 2

**Page 11** Wow ! What an opening paragraph. Cognitive – what exactly does this mean in this context ? It is a psychological jargon term that hints, for me, at the robotic programming nature of language. He presumably intends it to suggest behavioural influences, perhaps similar to those highlighted in longstanding psychological experiments showing the oppressive influence of group mentality on individual mentality. All this while still treating individual humans (persons) as ends in themselves.

Getting into this paragraph, it does actually contain the essence of the proper question to ask regarding the Nazis and their focus upon the Jews, *except* for the fact that, for him, the Jews play no part in the matter !! This rather reminds us of the nasty Jewish refrain from the mid-twentieth century era asserting that antisemitism was not a Jewish problem, but a problem belonging to none Jews. This miscreant, bias attitude of Musolff, does of course require that the whole kit and caboodle of Jewish slave ideology be assessed, essentially treating humans as individuals existing as ends in themselves that act evilly not functionally. Obviously, treating the organicist model of society as correct, entirely alters this interpretation, and includes Jews and Nazis alike, within one functional paradigm – and it is this fact Nazis history allows to be suppressed, exactly as Musolff seeks to do. Hence he is

here manufacturing knowledge of the Hitler Taboo, *part of*, that is, not *about* the Hitler Taboo.

---

Every time Musolff refers to Nazi's/Hitler's genocidal ambitions (toward Jews) this raises the spectre of Jews, as in why Jews ? and, What are Jews ? But Musolff is utterly blind to this issue, simply assuming that Jews are people, plain and simple, like any other, indistinguishable presumably, anymore than any other identifiable group of people. Which attitude only returns us to the question – Why Jews ? If we say why not Australian aborigines ? We instantly see that this would be irrelevant, which in turn tells us Jews are relevant. Good. Narrow the focus, why are they relevant, as present in Germany, yet prone to isolation ? But this implies Jews cannot be like other people, and we already know Musolff is not entertaining that idea. Of course since this time (mid twentieth century) the alien nature of Jews in our societies has been disguised by a deliberate policy of diversification through importing aliens, enabled by Hitler's war ! Boy was that Hitler good to the Jews or what !

**Page 12** Well of course 'metaphor', in this context, is a device of manipulative propaganda – the Bible is full of it ! But regarding Nazis, the question is why this 'metaphor', why at this time, and why in this form – i. e. antisemitism ? (*Great Hatred*, Samuel, 1940, has a chapter *Why Did it Happen now ?*)

---

Further use of the idea of people as robots programmed by language, only without admitting it, rather like Dawkins' treatment of religious people as robots/idiots without admitting the implication, and instead treating these dupes as fallen individuals who can do better !

---

The following paragraph is fascinating too as it raises the literal enactment of the politicised logic of sociological organicism, that is certainly abundantly evident in *Mein Kampf*. The nuance to mention here is the way we seem to be being told, for our audacity to reveal the truth, this is OK. So you have discovered you do not exist and you're all slaves of Judaism. Fine, that's how you want it, no problem – try this for size. And so the Nazis come along as the skull of master race transfiguration stripped of its smiling flesh of Christian imagery. So how grateful are we to be rid of this monstrous apparition of Judaism, and returned to the normal state of enslavement under which we all play along at being free ! This is encapsulated in people being treated as objects rather than agents, and it raises a question we have tackled fully in Atheist Science, in all sorts of ways. Of central concern for advocates of absolute truth, like ourselves, is how revealing that the human animal is a superorganism, and we do not exist, might play out. But the implication that is so often given out that by saying we are such is a heinous crime, is absurd, for revealing the truth can't change anything – yet, yet – see here, see the history Musolff is dealing with – its not true, our assertion that is, for revealing that we were robots *did* mean that we became robots ! Exactly, but not quite. Our masters removed their mask and created a social structure modelled on the bare faced scientific truth, which delivered the Hitler Taboo that allows us to sink back into a reality that is unaltered, save for in the manner of its representation. This was, and is, the function of the Nazis – this is the Hitler Taboo. It is telling us we cannot know reality. But the real reason we are placed in this bind is because the Jews are our masters and the Nazis were just apparitions of their normal form, metaphorically speaking the Nazis were the angry face of

Judaism that ordinarily wears a beneficent smile. All of this is dictated by nature because the human animal is a superorganism, not a person.

---

Obviously the use of loving terms to refer to brutal treatment is depraved, but not one iota different from our own government's use of language when it is on the war path against its objects of possession, as when referring to "making work pay" – which is so like "work shall set you free". By which they mean reducing benefits so that they are lower than the below substance level of wages available to most of us. So this use of sick, depraved language, by Nazis is meaningless, it adds nothing to any examination of what the Nazis were as distinct from other Western (Jewish) authorities, that thrive on the manipulation of language to suit themselves. At best all we can say of the Nazis is they made more of a travesty of this method than we are use to.

---

With the benefit of Duhring as a direct precursor of Nazi race based antisemitism and an idea of why this source came into existence, in reaction to Jewish emancipation, we have a tangible reason why linguistic force generated Nazi antisemitism when it did, as an aspect of structural changes in European slave society adjusting the position of exploitation serving the master race, as its biomass was about to realise the latent potential of European society to shed its skin and unleash a true global social form, which exists today. This led to the creation of Israel and global Jihad, the war of constructive global Judaism, necessary to this globalising process in the name of Judaism, where the Nazis were an early phase in this linguistic process organising global structure about the core of Jewish identity. The movement toward liberalisation is linked to the Jewish desire for liberalisation, according to Duhring, whereby Jews manipulated society by selecting one section of society after another to make a cause of agitation, and this is a fascinating idea because we live in a world today where this agitation is an endless process, where groups agitating for this that and the other advance, often paid for by state grants, religious, animal rights, medical rights, oppressive laws on drink or driving, all sorts of charities are organised to liberalise freedom for some, while eradicating others. All of this is a manipulation of linguistic force linked to identity structures, it is a social cleansing activity therefore, and Duhring associates it with the Jews because he says they are heavily involved in the liberal politics movement.

**Page 13**      Category error again – i. e. genuinely believing the human animal is what it is – a superorganism. Which he refers to as confusing humans with animals !  
Can you believe it ? This is like something straight out of the Bible. Too insane for words. So this man believes that humans are not animals. He would say we are more than animals – but that is a gross insanity that makes no literal sense scientifically speaking – although it is what *science* says, within this absolute theocracy of ours.

---

He can quote the Nazi use of correct science to produce perverted political imagery as insane, yet it never crosses his mind to denounce the Jews as insane for subscribing to religion. We could not ask for a more twisted, small minded mental attitude, than Musolff delivers here. His condemnation of Nazis is however the clarion call we hear – the message we are bathed in, so that we are, most of us, powerless to think it wrong, and presumably this is why Musolff writes as he does – he believes this bullshit.

---

An incapacity for ‘reality testing’ – and who is this Goldhagen ? He wouldn’t by any chance be a Jew would he ? You bet you’re life he is – and can anyone be less given to reality testing than a Jew – a person who by definition is religious ? Of course not. But this kind of madness somehow gets left out of the equation, because this is the part our masters want to preserve.

**Page 14**      What ‘cognitive’ means. Something like what we might have in mind when we talk of linguistic programming – i. e. something is cognitive if it constitutes a distinct programme – like a religion – which in effect takes possession of the individuals it enters. Sounds appropriate to Nazism, but we can bet Musolff would not agree to this meaning.

---

The trouble with these self-righteous pretensions of an intellectual treatment of Nazi ideas, is that they begin from the politically correct mantra of our own times, where racism has been written into law as a vicious, evil behaviour. This gives racism a reality that these people then treat as if it were a blunt act of murder or theft, something pathological to be explained. But all such intellectualisation amounts to is a kind of intellectualised political correctness extending the mantra of Jewish fascist political correctness into the academic space, as the religious message must occupy all spaces where ideas are made public. This process is all about capturing linguistic force, and using it to create social structure supplying core authority focused on the master identity – Judaism. This is seen in the highly contrived elaboration of language, jargon such as ‘iconographic reference’ to denote Hitler’s anti-Semitic terminology. In saying this we actually identify in Musolff’s co-workers the exact same behaviour as Musolff says Hawkins identifies in Hitler’s elaboration of language aimed at building images that can be translated into social structure. This of course is what language exists to do, so all Hawkins is doing is what he denounces in others, exactly as all priests of false knowledge always do in order to assert their ‘truth’ as the one truth, and all others as false.

**Page 15**      Slavishly obeying master ! Nice description of human individual nature.  
Except of course it is the Jews we all slavishly obey now. Only thanks to the Hitler Taboo, we cannot know this because Hitler put this knowledge, that created him as a monster, beyond the pale.

---

Hitler modelled himself on the Jews as the established master race that he *pretended* to want to replace, this is why he had this different idea of Jews as irredeemable enemies not even fit for slavery to Germans. In organicist terms this is a perfectly logical view as Germans could only become masters by destroying the Jews, exactly as the Jews did in Britain (Anglesey), when their agents of enslavement, Romans, exterminated the Druids.

**Page 16**      ‘Other forms of racism’ – i. e. religion – Judaism, Christianity and Islam being the most obvious ‘other forms’ we know of. Religion of the Jewish kind is a linguistic successor to race based identity. Therefore we mean racist in ‘essence’ – i. e. making one identity superior to all others – multiculturalism is a ploy applied after the Jews

have destroyed our European culture (Thus defending its replacement by aliens from any backlash on our part).

---

Chain of being is just another intuitive expression of reality, as indicated but not stated, it can best be seen expressed scientifically in ecology that describes food chains in dynamic hierarchical terms, with an apex species (hunter), always in ultimate position and fewest in number. Organicist science exactly replicates this logic in human superorganic contexts with Jews as master race, thinly dispersed everywhere to feed off everyone else accordingly. This is turned into a travesty, i. e. an anti-Semitic form, that provides the elite class of humans with the protective identity cloak that Musolff is brushing off in this work, as in sprucing up, not dismissing.

---

As we see this idea of Jews as parasites coming under examination again, it reminds me of a couple of books from the era of the social organism as a collective image of self consciousness, that created Hitler's ideas and hence the Hitler Taboo, which expressly used the idea of social parasitism : *Evolution by Atrophy*, Vandervelde, 1899, for example, so it will be a test of Musolff's honesty if he mentions such works, but we may be certain he will not because that would be veering towards the true origins of Hitler's antisemitism, that this work is expressly seeking to lose from the historical record by building on the fiction of a body politic ideology being the nature of the subject, when it is not, this simplistic model having been superseded from Comte onwards, until the First World War which served to physically cleanse this true science of humanity from existence in preparation for its expression being sealed off from future access, by an act of suppression – as in taboo, that took the form of Nazis racist ideology, that Musolff is so keen to have us believe was some kind of pathological aberration of the times. All things are always perfect, and cannot be otherwise – it is a *scientific* law of the universe, one might say *the . . .* law. Once we understand natural laws we can manage their effect – this is practical science – but we can never alter the laws themselves. So applying this logic to humans is not a recipe for despair as our masters always force us to believe, it is our one hope for freedom from a master like Jews, appearing in human guise on the basis of abuse personified by Hitler and the Nazis !

---

The sickeningly smug manner in which these delinquent pretenders to intellectual prowess tout their priestly wares, is infuriating. The parasitic model is a source idea for the holocaust, we are told. Which is true, but false because its parameters exert an artificially closed model that excludes Judaism from the picture, and humans too come to that, as an abstract entity to be understood in naturalistic terms. With a fully open picture, inclusive of all factors on equal terms, we see that it was true science that delivered the idea of social parasitism in society, and its channelling in the Hitlerian political form centred on the Jews, correctly targeted the force of human biological corporate nature, but did so in order to preserve Jewish master race identity from true science – which has indeed been successfully achieved for this exact reason !

---

It is clear that the alternative pivots of observation are critical to the manner in which linguistic force delivers social form in this context. Science acting on the new insight that the human animal is a superorganism indicates the true nature of social features like religion, and Judaism specifically, and then the intellectuals in power who control knowledge by virtue of

their professional status, deal with the resulting scientific ideas from the official pivot that says individuals are all that is real. This twists neutral science into a bias political form, and this is what produces the outcomes that lead to frightful conditions, as in the Nazis, that in turn allow social actions to treat science as responsible for these outcomes that in reality are due to the perversion of science by authority rooted in religion. None of this requires planning or understanding on anyone's part, this is a mass effect occurring spontaneously all over society, as religion pervades all society, all it needs is that everyone obeys the strictures of their role in society, which they do spontaneously, these roles having evolved at the behest of linguistic force acting over the course of millennia. Linguistic force creates these roles by building social structure cut through with channels along which this force flows, in the form of ideas or knowledge, of which religion is one type. Science cuts a new channel that religion needs to direct the flow of, back along religion's established pathways. This is done by politicising what science has neutralised, and this requires fabricating pseudo scientific knowledge, and causing *real* political problems, that licence political solutions employing physical force enabling the social cleansing dynamic to complete the social structure building process that linguistic force enacts.

The alternate pivots of observation carry a logic inherent to themselves, so that purpose borne of human corporate biological nature is inverted into reason borne of human individual being summoned as an end and creator. Thus we could say the purpose of the world war was to create the European union, as an imperative of human biological corporate nature. But in our world we are taught that the purpose of the union is to prevent the horror of such a war ever happening again, which of course it would do, but the logic has been inverted to provide this false, absurd reason, saying the object is to prevent war, that is nonetheless the only one we have, and is one that no one doubts for a second because all are programmed to think they exist in their own right and knowledge exists to serve individuals.

Saturday, 24 October 2015. I have been reading a novel recently, to fill my hours at work, novels not being at all my usual fare, *The Bees* by Laline Paull, 2014, is such a strange work. I mentioned this book below when I began reading it, but I am now coming to the closing part of the book. I just thought I would take notice of the peculiar use she makes of the idea of a social mind, the hive mind, which all the individual bees are linked into by their scent based mode of communication. Reviewing the above section where we speak of a uniform conceptual reaction occurring all across society in obedience to a core authority, brings Paull's use of this idea to mind. *The Bees* is fiction not science, but that the imaginative expression of human individuality transposed onto the insect superorganism should be result in such ideas, rings true to what we say does happen in the human superorganism, and as such the comparison is nicely rendered for our Atheist Science purposes.

**Page 17** Here's a fascinating turn up, he proposes to analyse an idea rather than presume upon its correctness. Well hallelujah. But actually he adopts this cautious methodology all the time – when responding to the ideas of his *fellow priests*. This gives the pretence of sound – scientific - methodology, but, as with the last case noted, he only performs these intellectual rituals within carefully prescribed limits of official dogma. Not once does he deign to question the whole topic in hand, as in what humans are as natural entities, what human biological nature is, what religion is, and above all else, what exactly Jews are ? No, this all goes by on a nod, of course it does. Although while he never questions these things, he does throw in askance comments openly avowing the official religious version, Jewish version, of what these things are, as when he denounces true science

– human animals as superorganisms – as a gross category mistake, if taken literally. From the beginning of religion's war against this modern science of sociology such verbal denunciations have been forthcoming, but never once does anyone delve into an argument as to why, the assumptions are always of the same dismissive kind seen here. Sorokin, 1928, was a backstop for such rejections in the mid twentieth century, but when examined we find Sorokin offers not one jot more than anyone else – dismissed on the basis of disgust – as we have already seen in Musolff – dismissed on the grounds of being grotesque. Unfortunately, saying the idea that the earth moves is 'grotesque' was not an argument against the scientific fact in the ancient world – and likewise for the human animal being a superorganism now. Just see the reaction of Trivers to my recent email, recorded here, for an example of how these great mediators of science react to the real science we call Atheist Science.

The study of metaphor in Hitler, 2005, must of been published after my own reading of *Mein Kampf* intended to discover sociological organicist ideas within, about which I posted a book to Scribd. Yet to visit Rush's work, but the focus on 'metaphor', described by Musolff as a great aid to 'political metaphor research' is hilarious – so clinical, in a bad way, by contrast to my method aimed at seeing how genuine science informed Nazism and aided Jewish master race identity continuity by capping off the destruction of a true science of human biological nature, by creating the Hitler Taboo that these people are adding incremental linguistic structures to by means of this detached analysis treating Nazism as an aberration, rather than a natural phenomenon, which it really is. The focus on this most important subject of master identity protection through the organisation of structures of linguistic force is fabulously revealing, making it so easy for our Atheist Science analysis to do its work, a result we have often noticed in the past when we have been lucky enough to drop on special works targeting the core topics of human biological corporate nature. (Saturday, 19 July 2014, Just bought a copy of Rush's book *Language of Violence*, 2006).

That Rush makes links to suggested precursors is fascinating, but again, as with Musolff, no indication of Nazi roots being sociological organicism, but rather earlier expressions of race superiority and anti-Semitic ideas. Such arguments are not consistent with the central claim that the idea of a social body inspired Hitler's version of anti-Semitic rhetoric. It suggests his ideas were a mere continuum from antisemitism genre – have to see what Rush says.

Oh, Ok, he says this himself – Hitler's antisemitism not original.

---

I only checked Rush today after transcribing this page of notes, so I have overlooked an important aspect of Musolff by forgetting this work, since looking at the book I just ordered from Amazon, Rush could well be the basis of his interest and approach to metaphor use in *Mein Kampf*.

**Page 18** This monstrous model of life formulated by Hitler comes across as utterly ludicrous – why would anyone want to concoct such an insane model ? And indeed what good did it do him or his beloved Germany ? It did the exact opposite of its intended aim – as stated. This is the most damning evidence that this was a Jewish *plot*, since the only benefits have been to the Jew's. But how can we say this in a presentable manner ? We do it by pointing out that these political behaviours are purely biological, and determined strictly by nature through the unifying of linguistic force along lines of established social structure. So all there is is the superorganism bearing a Jewish identity, and when linguistic force under this authority needs to, it flares up into a monstrous ideological rage that triggers an act of social cleansing that rids the human animal of the

disorderly expression of linguistic force, and returns it to a stable Jewish form. Yesterday, 17/4/14, *Channel 4 News* reported our prime minister, Cameron, ‘doing God’ – saying we should be more proud of being a Christian country and saying what Christianity has done for us. This is ultra religion of a kind unknown in British politics – this is the fruit of social cleansing, a key feature of which cleansing process is the formation of a taboo to suppress the real knowledge (the science of human nature) that was subverted by Darwin, and erased by war and priestcraft.

---

It is now Saturday, 11 July 2015, I am at work as a support worker in Hull. It is therefore well over a year since I last touched this work, having spent a year and a quarter working six days a week as a cleaner before getting this social work a couple of months ago, I have been unable to devote any effort to philosophy. One youth lives here and I am living here for one week, then home for a week, giving me a lot of free time at work and very little to occupy it, just what I need ! I anticipated this opportunity from the initial job I had, and prepared for it by buying this cheap laptop from EBay, though the first youth I worked with was of a different nature gave no such opportunity as this. The notes and book have sat patiently on my old mahogany carved work table waiting for this moment, so that now we may start where we left off a seeming age ago.

---

We have already dealt with the question of Hitler placing the Jews beyond toleration when we said this was because the Jews are the master race and Hitler knew this was *pretending* to want to replace them with the Germans – a truly facile idea for Hitler to of had – meaning he must of known this was a sham serving Judaism for he clearly understood the dynamics of the human biological corporate nature, as I point out in my earlier work (see above). Musolff is oblivious to such thoughts, a fact that is as equally incredible as that of Hitler’s failure to understand his own understanding ! The solution of these conundrums takes the usual path of individual nonexistence whereby people acting ambitiously – i.e. being priests of the message – collude with the message by allowing themselves to believe what it is to their advantage to believe, in keeping with the formation of their mental concepts during induction into the superorganism. This applies equally to Hitler and Musolff.

---

I have not done too much book buying of late but I have done a little. Two books I brought with me to Hull are *Darwin’s Ghost :In Search of the First Evolutionists*, Rebecca Stott, 2012, and *The Bees*, Laline Paull, 2014. I was dipping into *Ghost* last week and I sent the authoress an email on it yesterday, 10/07/2015, explaining to her that Darwinism was not science. She had evidently switch her imposed childhood allegiance to religion to the freedom of science, and had no idea of the sham this new found *freedom* represented. Her book made a useful contribution to our work by picking up deeper threads of the story leading to the sham ideas of Darwin, that have been imposed as a scientific triumph. In the process she introduces aspects of the way individuals come to promote radical ideas that are at odds with the establishment, unwittingly indicating how the process of knowledge manipulation takes place over centuries, as a natural linguistic process, delivering the exquisite result we see today where the subversion of science is achieved with such awesomely subtle effectiveness.

As to *The Bees*, what can one say ! I began examining this yesterday, it is a novel and I had read the blurb saying it made of insect nature a eulogy to nonexistent human individuality, in a travesty of reason and reality to match any ever produced. It makes me



think of the likes of Von Daniken's manipulation of archaeological evidence portrayed as evidence of an astronomical nature, as proof of alien visitations to earth instead of the activities of ancient prehistoric peoples. Despite this preparedness it is quite something to read the freedom with which this authoress has imposed the illusion of human individuality so totally upon the automatism of the hive bee, along with an extraordinarily free use of human mannerisms to enable the deceit to be worked out. I just thought I should note these latest activities as we begin our work once again, though I suppose there is no specific relevance to these notes on page eighteen.

*Science is the dark matter of religion.* Meaning that science is religion, creating the mass of knowledge in our world within which religion retains its position as the basis of core authority, via a relationship that is not recognised because science is seen as separate and independent of religion, hence science is an unseen mass of knowledge allowing the power of knowledge as religion to do its work, as the product of a linguistic force creating social form. This conception of science as the 'dark matter of religion' came to me after writing yesterday's email noted above, to the authoress of Ghost, and I wanted to record its conception.

**Page 19** Musolff displays a depth of vicious, wilful ignorance, unabashed, because he thinks no one will know what he is doing. This Chain Being shit is concocted to give him a foundation to build his deception upon, so that having elaborated it he knocks it down in a crass manner supposedly proving Hitler's intellectual degeneracy. This might be in what academic philosopher's jargon is called a 'straw man' – something created to be burnt by way of advancing a bias argument. His premise is that Hitler's ideas were part of a body politic continuum, yet he wants to sever Hitler away from any possibility of validation, so he suggests a possible continuum but then declares the connection spurious because Hitler's ideas were ad hoc – being spontaneously driven from a fixed point of origin that has no depth of any kind – being a mere hatred of Jews. Yet our whole argument contradicts this on the basis of nineteenth century sociological organicism, to which Musolff is utterly blind. This is an extraordinarily obtuse work, a master piece of myopic history that can only be engaged in under the sharply defined shelter of a taboo that cuts present life off from recent history in terms of knowledge, as sharply as any guillotine ever severed a posh nob's head from its shoulders. This the 'precipice of taboo', the rewriting of history under the shelter of knowledge suppression.

Insert : 11/07/2015.

The taboo, we may say, is the guillotine enabling the rewriting of history, indicating the importance of this kind of manipulation of knowledge via mechanisms of knowledge control that have their point of origin in genuine political actions, in this case the actions of the Nazis. Thus if the fabrication of an elaborate textual religion like that of Judaism is the main act of knowledge control that establishes a mode of political life, then these adjuncts to its operation are the counter political movements and their representation as 'evil' and such like. It is quite clear that this manifestation of human political activity, in which we include all collective social actions, are created linguistically and driven by a process of linguistic activity. Here we are seeking to reveal the mechanisms of the linguistic process manifesting as a political product that is human life as we know it.

---

Taboo as a structural basis of priesthood – Its fascinating to see the supreme arrogance with which this man presumes he knows something. It attains this state of deluded self-satisfaction by being part of an immense knowledge controlling structure, as we see from his self placement within a school of work, he himself being a professional academic.

---

Love the reference to a ‘virus of the mind’ – very us. But the ensuing diatribe of concocted jargon is befuddling. Again we find a simultaneous performance of the ‘crime’ being committed against language by Musolff and compatriots as he/they accuse Hitler of, namely of concocting verbalisations conjuring up ideas to form mental impressions to make some fictional appearance real. Of course, as stated in our introduction to Atheist Science, false knowledge is biologically functional as the programme delivering social structure, so that while we cannot help criticising the pathetic contrivances of these academics dead set on serving their Jewish masters, we actually must understand that they, like Hitler, are *doing* no such thing. Rather it is the linguistic programme of Jewish slave identity that is *doing* this via these individuals acting in the capacity of robotic units, having no idea at all of the gross absurdity of all that they do, knowing only that by acting as they do they acquire great prestige and reward within the physiology of the human animal they are a perfectly integrated part of. This success in life naturally reinforces their sense of rightness, as does the approved characterisation of that which they attack. Thus their actions make the fiction of Judaism real, exactly as Hitler’s did !

Note inserted : 11/07/2015.

It is interesting to read these notes on the manner in which individuals act in our society after describing the way that bees are represented as individuals in *The Bees*, for here we are in effect performing the exact same process of comparison, going the other way, making human individuals into the likeness of robotic social insects, only we are not feigning any kind of artistic ruse, we are simply describing reality exactly as it is, directly from life.

---

The realisation of reality as fiction is only threatened if someone should reveal the truth, someone like ourselves, and hence the need for evil being made into a ‘real fiction’ apropos Hitler, and the resulting taboo shutting the truth teller out, even should they arise.

[11/07/2015. Obviously in order to create a taboo against the truth the truth must of been created, hence the period of genuine freedom associated with the rise of science, brought to an end with the arrival of the official culmination of this process, Darwinism, which then allowed the process of taboo construction to proceed where it was required, as in the bearing of science to the nature human life, culminating in the Hitler Taboo. Which provides an explanation for the oft noted link between Darwinism and Nazism, which of course has had to be downplayed as part of the process of nurturing the dark matter of religion.]

The glaring offence in this passage is the way these academics single out Hitler as an example of linguistic abuse, instead of developing a theory of language showing such abuse is the exact biological purpose of language and at best all we can say of Hitler is that he tweaked this a notch further than we find in everyday cases, where however the enduring ensconced presence of our ‘beneficent’ abusers, has a far more damaging effect because we are powerless against it. Hence the contrast between the Jews as Hitler and the Jews as Jews. At the present time we live under the heel of Jews as Jews – expressed in global capitalism – which is enough to make us wish Hitler had been for real, and he had won. Do not get carried away with this suggestion, it is rhetorical, there never was any reality to the Nazi fiction – beyond that which we saw, that did its work to perfection – hence the unassailable domination of Judaism today, expressed most powerfully in global Islam.

**Page 21** We have an incidental recognition here that all mental content (ideas) are a form of programming – i.e. memetic (having to do with memes, 12/07/2015) and hence parasitic in nature. But still this fact fails to open this dork's eyes to the truth of the idea he is fighting against, still he clings to the sacred principle of individual being.

As Musolff proceeds to tackle how Chilton treats Nazism as a meme complex infecting people's minds, we find an analysis in evidence that implicitly treats linguistic products as a programme organising individual behaviour to bring about social form. This is perfect for our argument but these priests forge ahead carrying their assumption of divine individuality before them.

---

He expressly refutes a popular conception of parasitism relevant to Hitler's propaganda, but we have already noted one work of sociology from the turn of the century expressly dealing with the nature of parasitism both in nature and in relation to human society (Look for it on shelf).

**Page 22** This negative account of available concepts within the public domain is only possible because of the deliberate, and quite astounding blanket of disregard of sociological organicism, that was a massive phenomenon during Hitler's lifetime, and a huge reservoir of ideas that the Western world was *immersed in* !

---

The authorities Musolff names are new to me and he directly refutes any direct link between ideas in the public domain and Hitler's ideas. This is too gross to be borne. Who is this man ? What is he trying to do ? Hitler was manufactured by genuine science – directly – that is why we say the Hitler Taboo exists as a block on any further recurrence of freedom in science. This incredible, dishonest isolation of Hitler from any direct influence, suggests a deliberate effort to sever any possible justification for his anti-Semitic ideas. This is a key piece of evidence showing that this book is an elaborate extension of the Hitler Taboo itself, we might almost call it a new chapter of *Mein Kampf* !

The promise to explore the bio-political realm is most pleasing, whatever the justification.

**Page 23** (May 6/14) Cognitive importance = linguistic programme – i. e. An idea that serves to control individuals so as to organise them into a foci of superorganic power, expressing linguistic force. Central to this programming process (cognitive), is the importing of identity. Nico Mouton in an essay on the social organism gives us an idea of what this cognitive model is, mentioning its leading exponent as expressly saying that a metaphor is not a process. His convoluted definition of what it is, lies at the heart of how these priests seek to force their abstruse logic into conformity with the false pivot of individual being, even as they deal with the very essence of everything that demonstrates the individual does not exist. Hence they avoid the simple scientific idea of linguistic programming and instead concoct the extravagant notion of cognitive phenomena – i. e. mental expressions of individuals, which should reflect the authority of the free individual, but can be subverted by abusive individuals (Hitler) – giving us these *bizarre* metaphors. Yeah, and no other forms of such collective control spring to mind ! As in religion.

---

Sunday, 12 July 2015.

One thing that is interesting to note that I do not recall stating previously, is how this new idea of memes that has swept upon the intellectual world over recent decades, is here freely applied to penetrate the ‘mystery’ of Nazism as a human phenomenon arising from the modern world, that jars with all that our world is supposed to be, in terms of advancement over past ages. I likewise immediately applied the insight that humans are a species of superorganism in an equivalent manner, but the product of applying memes reinforces establishment rule because this ludicrous model of linguistic dynamics initiated by Dawkins, is, like that of his hero, Darwin, all about promoting the false idea of the individual, and has been designed to be safe in this regard, as opposed to my organicism which is simply meant to be true to reality, to be science in other words.

---

The manner of the obsequious defence for daring to say that the slightest degree of reason is contained in anti-Semitism is truly sick. This is the Hitler Taboo in extension. We build a genuine science of history on the core logic of Nazism, an inevitable result of recognising that Nazi anti-Semitism is in reality a taboo silencing any negative treatment of religion as a natural phenomenon.

---

Attractive for followers – applies religious logic of belief as being chosen by free individuals, rather than programmed into them by their masters as really happens.

‘Understanding cognitive pattern’ suggests a natural force creating Nazism, but not drawn from a general theory of cognitive patterns described here, implying this scientific logic is only applicable where human ideas are denounced, in other cases the process is fully under conscious control therefore. Deeply disgusting stuff. Exactly what we would expect to see in a priestly successor to Hitler himself !

**Page 24** Mannheim is the edition [of *Mein Kampf*] I read years ago for the purpose of discovering sociological organicism therein, and hence I developed my ideas of the Hitler Taboo posted to Scribd long ago. Musolff’s approach to this subject is bizarre. It is clearly designed to *deprive* Nazism of any semblance of history – which in popular language/ideology, is a given. Whereas I could not conceive of such an idea, this is the ultimate tool of psychopathic, alien master race mentality.

---

My passion about these matters, seen in the closing words above, records the impression made upon me at the time of reading, which has as much to do with the content of my own brain in respect to this subject, as anything stated by Musolff himself. So that a statement like this referring to an ‘alien master race mentality’ is related to the context it remarks upon, and must be taken as such, and not as a reflection of a state of mind I am possessed of and would apply generally.

**Page 25** These passages from *Mein Kampf* are expressing the sociologically organicist idea that society is a social organism whose form is realised in the state/nation. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the ‘body politic’ model, that until I picked up Musolff I’d never even heard of in relation to the social organism and the period in question (1850 – 1930.)

So, that the organicist model of society as a 'sick being' was extant before 1914, might be taken to refer to the popular idea of sociological organicism expressed in the term 'social organism', that dominated society at this time, which, though theorised about, had never been coalesced into a clear idea of reality, such as that which Hitler brought forth. So this view of Musolff's drawn from *Mein Kampf* is superb for our purposes as it perfectly matches our argument for a link between true but religiously thwarted science, and its inspired release via the agency of Nazism in a monstrous form, giving us a taboo insuring a real science of humanity would never rise again.

---

Commenting on the last question shows this moron, Musolff, blind to the wonderful description Hitler uses to describe the workings of a human superorganism, simply treating the whole diatribe as utter nonsense conjured up to enhance a racist ideology. This is the work of a stunted priestly mind, with all the limitations of a thirteen year olds self absorbed vision of reality. What is required here is an *adjustment* of Hitler's usage so that the usual crass Spencerian analogical model is given real scientific meaning, and the master identity of the Jews is shown to be a natural product of human, biological corporate nature, not evil or malignant, but natural and healthy, from the human animal's point of view, if not ours.

**Page 26** Hitler's organicist model was not arbitrary, but sophisticated ! Indeed, because it was not his model. It was the fruit of more than a century of fabulous scientific effort in sociology, delivering a contemporary school of organicist sociology from which this greatest ever defender of the Jews, Hitler, could draw his model to be a figment of linguistic force, from which a social structure could be conjured up to show where this *monstrous* science would take us if we insisted upon having the truth – hence Hitler fashioned the Hitler Taboo.

---

'tacit assumption' is a nice phrase to see here for it is the political, false pivot version, of our subliminal meaning, or bias quotient of meaning, carried by all words in a language's lexicon, to deliver the uniformly bias interpretation spontaneously and unwittingly (subconsciously), by fixing our mental imagery around the false pivot of the day/culture – i. e. in Judaism = individualism. Musolff of course applies this false pivot seamlessly and mindlessly, despite being able to identify it in Hitler. The reason is that even here he applies his tacit assumption, so that seeing this flaw in Hitler never prompts Musolff to think it might be a sign of something more general – which it is !

---

Importance of 'tacit assumption' – i. e. subliminal meaning, such as that which delivers our delusion of self existence, is noted, but crudely identified as a mechanism of logic, that it undoubtedly is, only needing a more sophisticated treatment to recognise why. Musolff rejects the mechanism of 'tact assumption' however, using it here to denote a flawed consistency – which is exactly right – using a false pivot – individualism – does indeed guarantee consistency which flows uniformly to a purpose – that of empowering the authority delivering the bias message – not Nazism – but Judaism. Judaism being the real foci of ideology behind Hitler's version of true science.

**Page 27** And here Hitler is shown to of linked the popular – i. e. widely known idea of sociological organicism, to a real state of society. The important thing here is that he was merely tapping into a collective idea that genuine social science had developed in the social body over the course of decades, while being unable to bring its ideas to

completion because of where they led in terms of destroying Judaism, as the ultimate end point. Hitler in effect burst this pustule of knowledge, and the Hitler Taboo constitutes a scab sealing true science – no metaphor this, for it is an accurate description of reality, only forced to use metaphorical language – similes – in order to make the point because no true science has been allowed to develop its own language for this natural process. We do of course describe these behaviours in more scientific language in other contexts allowing it – process, programme, linguistic force, foci thereof, and such like, but in this example the discussion is best made using perfectly suited metaphorical descriptions, as long as we ensure that we do not consider our metaphors to be metaphorical, *at all*.

---

As Musolff drones on about his analytical jigsaw, speaking of images mapped onto targets, we continue to see how he isolates the genuine science of human society that is Hitler's source for a well constructed and well received logic, and seeks to make it a contrivance of Hitler's exclusively – clearly to deny any real basis to an argument that in *Mein Kampf* forms nothing less than a complete philosophy, and in the real world more than amply demonstrated its ability to act as such. It is the implication and veracity of understanding that Musolff is striving to deny Hitler here, as he stated was a requirement demanded by all *anti-racist fascists* at the beginning of the chapter. Anti-racist bodies today, like animal rights fanatics, use their extreme 'anti-ism' ideology to justify *any action*, which blind intolerance of opposition for the declared ideals, equals fascism.

Table 3.1 – I overlooked this, but it is a nice simple representation of the structural elements of a genuine scientific analysis of human nature, albeit delivered via a perverted form of this true scientific model. Musolff provides us with six broad superorganic anatomical/physiological categories. I have never had a table to work from before, it certainly concentrates a lot of information in a simple package. But how to unpack it ? As ever, we need to replace Hitler's/Musolff's crude, bias model, with our scientific model. Superorganism has the appearance of decay seen in a threat to corporate identity, this is part of a wider natural process whereby continued social cleansing preserves Judaism, while constantly remaking the host (biomass) construction, to ensure that no competing identity can ever exist for any length of time – this cleansing process is represented as having to do with 'illness', when it is the exact opposite – it is about maintaining health ! [The true object, or being, in this setting not being identified in the accounts given. Monday, 13 July 2015.] So for us this table summarises the basic elements of Hitler Taboo manufacture, rather as Musolff says it does, only for us its significance is what it does not say, exactly as the Hitler Taboo requires of itself in order to be a taboo – a bias programme delivering a specific piece of social structure.

Table 3.2 (plus description). It is not clear to me that this adds anything new, except I like the idea that Hitler's model is essentially superficial, having just one piece of evidence for illness, and therefore one target cause. This is well suited to our purpose of understanding how Judaism created an anti-Semitism model on the basis of sociological organicism, indicating that it merely required a sparse of expression, which makes sense, political ideology always must be succinct and to a point. This of course was of no use to Hitler, but it was vital for the Jews. A true 'Hitler' figure – wanting to break free of Judaism, would of wanted the real truth to be known, not a sterile version calculated to draw the venom from the contemporary historical situation, which is all that this pared down organicist model of Hitler's could ever do, and all it did. This shows that Hitler was a precisely generated product of Judaism, exactly as all our leaders/priests are, men like Darwin, Dawkins and Musolff. Hitler was a product of the time – an individual fashioned by linguistic force to meet the needs of the superorganism – like a new antibody conjured up by an immune system to meet a new genetic threat. Nazism was a linguistic formula modelled on the threat of

science applied to humans, but evolved to key into that idea, to attach to it, and thereby in an act of self-destruction to destroy the threat. The organ of immunity is the academic/intellectual machinery of knowledge control and message production, where, under Musolff, the work of knowledge control continues to suppress the truth and preserve identity. I have often said that the only rational explanation for the insanity of the two world wars was that their sole purpose was to cleanse society of the unwanted proliferation of scientific knowledge generated by the scientific revolution. In Hitler we have a nice example of this cleansing process revealed in a concentrated form – in an author. This is because the war had done its job of removing science, now it just needed capping off. I love this book, even as I hate it.

**Page 29** Musolff's arrogance while posing as an intellectual of sublime composure is infuriating. I leapt ahead and then back on this page, thus being prepared for what contrivance was to come before reading the quotes. I read *Mein Kampf* over a decade ago I would think, but I *feel* as if I remember this bullshit comparison between races and species. But for Musolff to say the 'crude equivalent' has baffled all comers is totally disingenuous, for the basic idea is too simple not to be understood, and if we go back to the early days of this subject's emergence in intellectual works – late eighteenth, early nineteenth centuries, the question of what races are and whether humans were one species or more was openly debated. It is not difficult to see how racial integration could form [produce] such a negative idea [reaction]. And what are human races anyway ! Races are pre-linguistic, i. e. genetic, mediums of corporate identity, so that your racial identity use to be the equivalent of your religious identity today, and we know all too well how these insanities are fought over. With the arrival of fully evolved linguistic slave making [identities] like Judaism the day of racial identity was doomed, and has now become anathema, but Hitler's ideas dismissed so childishly here, are an exact equivalent to those of Judaism which rules our world. Of course we are never going to get any balanced delivery from this fascist anti-racist ideology, truth no more interests him [Musolff] than it did the man he honours in this extension of his work.

---

Anyway Musolff opens his attack on Hitler's use of the Jewish establishment's false scientific Darwinian model of evolution – provided by the forces of religious authority supplying free science, by taking the puerile attitude that Hitler's ideas are to be taken seriously, when he drivels on about species integrity. Hitler, again, is doing no more than all the priests in our world when he takes the part of a juvenile feigning idiocy – and indeed, we soon enough get to the point which we could of seen coming a mile off, if we had the least intelligence.

---

Why would anyone invent the term 'nonsensicality' ? Is that a horrible use of English or what ? The 'nonsensical nature' of, is all that is required. One feels this is part of the conjuring of a derogatory image that its craft workers feel requires the invention of such terms denoting a state of consciousness or something, that obviously would not be implied by my regular English usage that deals with a specific case. [Tuesday, 14 July 2015. The spell checker did not query this word, is it in the dictionary ? Being away from home I have not got my usual resources available.]

---

Again – entering the world of the insane – why say this about the Nazis and not say it about the Jews, who are vastly more fanatical about their existence as some mystical entity than Hitler ever was ? And all other religions too.

---

Hitler's targeting of the Jews is 'psycho-pathological'. Yet in truth the exact opposite is the case for the Jews are, self evidently, the true master race, half the world's population is enslaved to Judaism via its two slave identities of Christianity and Islam. And it is this fact that makes Hitler's 'insanity' functional – as a taboo serving Jews.

---

'Catastrophic consequences' – indeed, destruction of science and the preservation of religion.

**Page 30**      Must suspend our awareness that the Jews were an invalid target of master (parasitic) identity. No justification for this fundamental stance, that we categorically refute and reverse. And now Social Darwinism raises its ugly head – a great enemy of ours, for it exists to act as a vortex of linguistic force that all ideas treating society as a natural phenomenon can be thrown into, and there pulverised. No surprise to see it make its appearance here then, and sooner rather than later.

---

Mentions polygenist theory suited to Hitler's racist science, which he confirms (and that I have previously also said was so).

---

In this section we find Musolff at pains to perform the usual priestly excision of Darwin from his real contribution to our history. Without the false science of Darwinism the insane ideology of Nazism could never have existed, as demonstrated by eugenics and Social Darwinism discussed here, but dishonestly so, as usual, using these ideologies as precursor taboo formulations to keep people from applying the false, and hence highly dangerous ideas of natural selection, to humans. Thus Darwinism was a vital transitional step toward Hitler Taboo formation, and it is precisely this fact that Social Darwinism has been singled out to deny. Social Darwinism was not *openly* espoused by Darwin, the argument goes, and its being implicit would be denied on the basis that humans are not covered by natural selection ! We make ourselves !! All this is standard formulaic priest craft in our post scientific age.

Tuesday, 14 July 2015

Slightly awkward expression used in these notes requires a little clarification. Not sure why I would say that false ideas are dangerous, since the central theme of my work is that it is the truth that is really fatal, so this can be ignored as such. But the idea that provisional taboo formulations were generated by false science, most particularly Darwinism, giving us the likes of eugenics and Social Darwinism as taboo stages toward a final formula, is undoubtedly important. The culmination of this taboo generating aspect of the knowledge creation and control process being the Hitler Taboo, that incorporated these two stages of taboo structure within it. Linguistic force and social structure as commensurate realities become almost tangible in a discussion of this kind, as we can feel the link between social life and ideas, and sense that this is all there is, there is no added value of the kind associated within individualism, as in purpose, will power, intention, ambition, or any of these illusory ideas.

**Page 31**      We can see how amateurish, useless, and hopeless Darwin was as a scientist from this inconsistent and contradictory drivel about European and other races. Musolff uses the nasty phrase 'politically correct' as if it were something to respect ! And he pointedly seeks to delineate between Darwin and Hitler by saying Hitler would never



concede affinity to dark races. As ever Musolff never manages to raise his argument above the rank of peevish, snob educated, thirteen year old school boy mentality.

---

There is so much of interest in Hitler's triadic structure of human society in which we find delineated creators, bearers, and destroyers of culture. In this context 'bearer' could be seen as my 'slave' identity/biomass. The only snag with this characterisation is that the Jews are both the creators and the destroyers – necessarily, for theirs is a slave making culture, that is why social cleansing is the core of Jewish societies and why Hitler was created. All such musings are denied Musolff, his consciousness skims off the surface of such fascinating facts as he only has one purpose – to heap villainy upon Hitler, so that understanding anything is not an idea he can comprehend outside this remit.

**Page 32**        Deeply egregious assertion against the facts of history, saying no biological source informing Hitler's hierarchical model of society, so that his ideas were mere concoctions snatched from thin air. Disgusting lies. The whole point about sociological organicism emerging under the idea of society as a true superorganism, is that it led directly to the conclusion of a hierarchical social structure, animated by competing cultural identities that consisted of a small master class ruling a huge slave biomass. No one ever said this because they could not – hence it was left to Hitler to give a miscreant political version of this model to create a taboo that would ensure that the informal sanction against speaking the truth would be set in the concrete of taboo prohibition.

---

These references to Hitler's use of Jewish mythology to enhance his self-aggrandizement are indicative of the man's true nature as a slave of Judaism, serving Judaism. He knew that Christianity was a Jewish slave identity but still wanted Germans to be Christians. And he hated atheism as a denial of corporate authority, so reading between the lines we find a typical priestly style at work, albeit of an exceptionally megalomaniacal kind, but the exceptional condition was a product of his time, not a creation of his own.

---

His religious content was important in obtaining popular support – exactly – Nazism was in other words a classic Jewish religious sect.

**Page 33**        Agree with Musolff, Hitler's religious allusions are all to a purpose, the man had no real convictions of any kind, as with most priests, including Musolff, they just want glory and status according to the formula they are attached to. Given that individuals have no real existence of their own, this seemingly shallow condition is inevitable. Would be leaders must serve whatever power presents itself, hence we are always saying there are priestly types just wanting power and status and they have no inner values, they acquire whatever 'values' are of the moment. This is why politicians are always the very lowest calibre of humanity, because they are in effect natural born criminals, bereft of any conscience.

**Page 34**        Nice reference to 'herd instinct', this idea is seen in several titles I know of from about the time of World War One, and it clearly constitutes a popularisation of the sociological organicist idea of the social organism. This is not 'body politic terminology'.

And again we must agree with Musolff about Hitler's pragmatism and total disregard for consistent logic in his model of existence. In this he was like any religious propagandist – just full of it.

**Page 35** Love to see this thoroughgoing analysis of *Mein Kampf* centred on its anti-Semitism, which has been such an important matter in my philosophy. Even if the result adds nothing in particular to what we can get from reading Hitler for ourselves. A table like this is not so much useful for understanding Hitler, but rather for summarising Musolff's understanding of Hitler, with its idiosyncratic use of terms like 'target levels' and sources etc. And as per Musolff's conclusion, of course Hitler's ideas are consistent and culminate in a global concept, why wouldn't they? Because they are stupid and offensive? So what is new in that for world dominating ideas?

**Page 36** Musolff chooses to disregard Hitler's religious, messianic nature, for lack of evidence, saying his religiosity was playing politics. The idea that he wanted to exterminate Jews from existence is clearly ludicrous as a real goal, and can only ever of been hyperbole, but instead of seeing this Musolff proceeds to take the core act underpinning the Hitler Taboo at face value – I wonder why? I even have a book about the agreement to send Jews to Israel with the assistance of the Nazis regime! Jewish nirvana or what?

---

Again, the idea of social parasitism was developed by academics along sociological organicist (biological) lines.

**Page 37** Quite – parasitic nature of the Jews whose form acts in various ways. Hitler was right, the only cure for the parasitism of the Jewish master race is the eradication of Judaism – Judaism that is – not Jews. Therein lies the crucial difference between a true scientific model and Hitler's political model serving Judaism itself. But even more, we should note that a true science of human nature would not judge these matters at all, it would simply describe them as the natural healthy state of being that they are. This kind of dispassionate idea is what Jews could not survive, and they needed a Hitler to render impossible to develop.

---

Hitler's quote describing a parasite killing its host omits to discuss the reality that Jewish master identity turned its host into Jews of another name by implanting a Jewish slave identity – Christianity and Islam in particular, but Hitler's own ideology, as can easily be seen, was one such Jewish slave identity, which is why he omits to mention this fact of host longevity under parasitism here.

---

No, no, no. The best way to understand the blood relation idea is as an intuitive, pre real knowledge (science) idea. Just as the idea of a supreme being or God is an intuitive idea of a real object – the superorganism. This fool just does not understand the most basic aspects of human intelligence.

**Page 38** This is totally correct, Jews are an eternal threat to all other identities because

Jewish identity replaces the social programming that existed prior to the arrival of Jews. Problem with Hitler's use of this scientific fact is its distortion into a Jewish identity formula – Aryans – instead of its generalisation into a scientific model negating all power – which was certainly not what Hitler wanted. He did not want to exterminate the Jews he wanted to become the Jews, by reversing the dynamic of master race identity formation. This shows how well Hitler understood this key idea of the social organism, so well he was able to manipulate it in a fully conscious way to suit his *Jewish* purposes of power politics.

---

Of course in our Atheist Science individuals do not exist and are no more culpable for their *evil* actions than any other biological agent, such as bacteria, are. No Jewish, Christian or Muslim, can be held responsible for their religious identity, they have little choice in this matter.

**Page 41**      Blood poisoning (identity replacement) is the basic nature of Jews and it precisely indicates what Jews as a cultural form are, and why they exist as an expression of human biological corporate nature.

**Page 42**      As indicated, the identification of the Jews as master race is inherent in the social organicist science dominating Western society at the time of Hitler's existence, so for a Hitler Taboo to be of any use it had to project this fact [Jewish master identity] to the highest level of *negative* exaltation – hence extermination was an imperative of the whole reason for Nazi existence, as seen by me as a pivotal element of the social cleansing process protecting Judaism from decay and eradication due to the corrupting influence of science upon ruling identity mythology.

**Page 43**      Organicism ignored by historians – he means to correct this.

**Page 45**      Hitler's hatred of atheists is of interest to me but not to commentators who like to call Hitler himself an atheist, which, pragmatic or not, i.e. sincere or not, Musolff's comments on the religious content of *Mein Kampf* indicates he was fervently in favour of Jewish slave ideology (Christianity) for his German people.

**Page 46**      Social cleansing is the single most important feature of complex human superorganic physiology, and as such the Jewish master race identity myth having the Jews as the chosen and destined to survive all other peoples has the social cleansing mechanism at its core. This vitally important fact is utterly transparent to the mind of commentators programmed to the false pivot of individuality. The adoption by Hitler of a thoroughgoing cleansing policy only further indicates how consciously he understood the science of sociology based on the social organism, that prevailed during his lifetime – an important point in relation to understanding the origins of Hitler's antisemitism in relation to sociological organicism that Musolff purports to treat of, but clearly does not. This is because Musolff is determined to deny any basis to Hitler's organicism, it would be unthinkable for Musolff to start giving a factual treatment of these matters such as we

provide, even if he could conceive of them without adopting a true pivot of observation having the superorganism as the human animal.

**Page 48** In other words law in Nazi Germany was made in exactly the same way as it is in Britain – by lies, manipulations, contrived evidence and extended campaigns, stirring the emotions while triggering widespread fear of the consequences of people doing what they have always done – drink driving, and recently, laws against being unemployed.

---

Tuesday, 28 July 2015 – Having always loved drink driving I resent the contrived propaganda used to justify laws that cripple the sensible drink driver from having any kind of decent life, which requires a car to allow them to go to pubs. Having devoted my life to living on the dole I likewise resent the switch that has forced me into work, but the reference above is to the big brother language that has been employed to wage war on the unemployed, whereby the idea that work ‘will always pay’, refers to the fact that benefits are being illegally denied people, so that of course being a menial slave pays well, compared with destitution !

**Page 49** These lying, manipulative tactics, are exactly those used by our politicians to force us into Europe and to turn us into an Islamic state by stealth. Last night, Friday 16/5/14, the leader of the Labour Party, Ed Milliband, a Jew, sat there giving his sickening spiel about getting rampant immigration wrong, not having realised that by flooding our society with cheap labour this would impact on British people at the lower end of the income scale. These are the people Hitler learnt how to be Hitler from.

**Page 50** Speaks of a secret taboo which is akin to the Hitler Taboo he is extending here – unbeknownst to himself ! It is inevitable that genuine taboos be of this curious nature whereby everyone knows a given idea cannot be spoken of even though no one ever does speak of it ! This is achieved by initiating genuine acts of terror such as the holocaust and linking them to the forbidden knowledge – as in the science of sociology based on the idea of the social organism = Hitler Taboo. When E.O. Wilson published *Sociobiology* in 1976 his colleagues went ballistic with openly expressed hatred because he hinted that human society might be some kind of natural phenomenon and this triggered the taboo amongst intellectuals, forbidding all approach to this true science that had been destroyed at such cost and difficulty.

**Page 54** Nesting site – nice – reminds us of a queen insect.

**Page 56** It is true that Jews as a ‘parasitic race’ have spread everywhere and a scientific explanation for this fact is clearly possible. We give it often. Jews are a master race culture and slave maker social body, exactly as Hitler’s ideas say, but not how he says it.

**Page 62** This is an astounding vision of reality that emanates from the real world,

describing the absolute truth that nothing can save us from the Jews, as is more than amply proven with the horrific ingress of Islam into Europe and the rise of Islamic (Jewish) terror on a global scale. Goebbels' description of this dire situation voices knowledge that could only be possessed by one versed in the science of the social organism that alone revealed the true nature of Judaism. And here this science was being voiced openly under the pretence of acting against Jews, when the truth is that it was this monstrous use of this science that sealed the truth's fate, and condemned humanity to abject slavery to Judaism for an eternity to continue. Coming to the actual quote we find the true pivot of superorganic being nonexistent, while the false pivot indicative of the Jewish priest at work, is shown starkly in the statement that Jews – the masters and rulers – had no part in the society they ruled !! What ? There it is, Nazi propaganda was Jewish – seen in its adherence to the false pivot of individuality, irrespective of how devoted these thinkers were to a corporate model of human nature.

**Page 65** Sneering at Hitler's phraseology is belittling to Musolff, seems to be another way to attack – i. e. use the Hitler Taboo – against the genuine science that Hitler is bringing into disrepute here. To stroke ones bacteria is absurd, but nursing it would not be, and the evolution of parasitic viruses that create hosts with identities suited to the parasite – i. e. nurtured by the host, is exactly how higher life forms evolved – *Origins of Identity*, Villarreal.

**Page 69** Rehashing his argument and dismissing Nazi organicism as incomprehensibly stupid in its comparison of political bodies with animals. However as we have been saying, the idea of the social organism was prevalent and fully supported by its own academic structure prior to World War One – Worms, and the French institute exemplifying this. In addition the grotesque characterisations, though certainly intended as a political effect by Hitler and not a rational explication of the science, did reflect the hard scientific facts of human biological nature that Hitler was exploiting, as is Musolff, by corrupt association.

**Page 70** Here Musolff is absolutely correct, but for wrong reasons. As we say in Atheist Science, the individual does not exist and cannot be deemed responsible for any actions or thoughts, scientifically speaking. This does not invalidate our treatment of one another as responsible agents for practical purposes, as we must live in this world and learn to respond to our environment. Moral responsibility is a priestly contrivance elaborating on this fact, as 'God' is elaborating on the intuitive knowledge of our being units of a superorganism and nonexistent in ourselves.

---

Wednesday, 29 July 2015 – Of course by 'priestly contrivance' we do not mean to infer that individuals are deliberately acting in this manner at their own inspiration, but only that they are acting as specialist units of the superorganic anatomy that have responsibility for developing, maintaining, and delivering the Message of superorganic being. A message they are as prone to as those 'they' manipulate, this is a hierarchy of manipulation that explains the structural hierarchy of society as we experience it.

**Page 71** We can remind ourselves again here of the *Great Hatred*, mentioned already for having a chapter specifically asking why now, the whole book being an argument that Nazi antisemitism was something altogether new in its nature – i. e. total cleansing – eradication.

---

Putting the question forcefully – where did the power of Hitler's ideas derive from ? My first thought is in the millennial long conditioning to the Jewish slave implant of Christianity which, as with Americans today, creates a mass populace of intelligent and powerful individuals who are utter morons – zombies trained to pay mindless heed to their masters – whoever holds the reigns of public power. This abject condition is only a tad hyped up on the normal state of mass idiocy found in all societies everywhere. This abject condition is what the power of language evolved to deliver as the means to create a true mammalian superorganism.

**Page 73** Exactly, Nazi organicism had to be widely understood by ordinary Europeans, and it was, in the form of the 'social organism', that Musolff refuses to acknowledge.

**Page 74** By acknowledging the danger of conferring respect upon Nazi organicism, Musolff alludes to the taboo dynamic that this whole business of Hitler and the Nazis is all about. The people he refers to to begin his discussion of the Great Chain of Being bullshit is so irrelevant to the subject of Nazi organicism it is gut wrenching to see this drivel introduced here. I have certainly never paid the least attention to this religious tosh – Lovejoy and son, its rubbish and has nothing to do with the origins of Nazi sociological organicism. I keep wanting him to refer to Lilienfeld or Schaffle, Worms or many others who created the novelty and its widespread awareness, that Hitler dissipated and excised from Jewish society – his society.

---

Wednesday, 29 July 2015 – Lost myself here with 'Lovejoy and son', did I mean Lovejoy and so on ? And is Lovejoy a modern writer on the planet as living being, Gaia ? Can't think just now.

---

The spontaneous generation of models of existence is still a matter needing explanation, and we do this by saying people are part of nature and as such they are evolved to form superorganic organs at the behest of linguistic formulas = knowledge. Such forms are purely functional in relation to the human animal superorganism, but their actual form inevitably takes its shape from reality, which, being unknown prior to modern science, meant all ideas about existence were intuitive representations of hidden realities. This is why the idea of God and the secular idea of society as a living entity arise spontaneously, and [the latter] arose in the nineteenth century under the influence of modern science that for the first time had the power to give a true rendition of reality, and it is this fact – its scientifically informed nature, that gave Nazi ideas their special potency, because of its [science's] complex, real formulation as sociological organicism, and the broad dispersal of this scientific knowledge in academic circles and out into the wider community.

**Page 75** Japanese culture used organicist knowledge of a tree to represent the triadic, religious, hierarchical structure of society.

---

Note this semantic/cultural based analysis of the origins of concepts of existence severs our ideas of reality from any true reality, that we seek by saying ideas are intuitive representations of reality, experienced for its consequences arising from hidden realities – such as the life force being a force of information – i. e. genetic. That there is a force in action is obvious, what it is, less so. And since our understanding does not exist to answer such questions, but to unify our behaviour, having intuitive ideas is what matters, true ideas being of no use for the function of superorganic integrity because they lack bias, and hence structural imperatives that are always found in organicist models – Plato – hierarchy of metals ; Japanese – hierarchy of plant parts ; Hitler – hierarchy of social ecosystem's human categories (races).

**Page 76** Returns to the idea of language as a biological flow of information, creating a programme organising individual behaviour to create a social form – except he does not pull these threads into this coherent scientific form, remaining fixed to the false pivot of individuality.

**Page 77** Further nice discussion of language forms/knowledge having a life of their own, but no rational framework to place this in because the biological nature of humans as social animals is not admitted.

---

Bloody hell – talk about building castles in the sky, he witters on endlessly and abstractly from premise to consequence, alluding to the need for earthing in reality, but never doing so. The metaphor of society as organism was a flourish of solid intellectual effort – as a cup of tea or beer is a product of a spring providing raw materials. Philosophy/science delivered the raw materials of this metaphor that Hitler drew on to concoct his brew. To listen to Musolf you would think these ideas simply materialised and blossomed amongst people for no reason whatever. No, science was a fountain of knowledge releasing the pressure of linguistic force in the flow of sociological organicism that Hitler tapped, the answer is simple, but Musolf's difficulty is that the last thing he wants to do, is to reveal the truth.

**Page 82** States categorical intention to examine nineteenth century organicist ideas connected directly with Hitler's organicism – can only mean the idea of the social organism.

**Page 83** My mistake, evidently, as he drones on uselessly about ancient religious gobbledegook – i. e. Western tradition influencing nineteenth century ideas, not nineteenth century ideas themselves. Shame. These being the only true source of Hitler's organicism.

**Page 85** Lilienfeld's 1873 book on society as a true living being also acknowledges

these distant roots of the comparison, demonstrating that his modern take was something entirely new and different – because it treated society in a scientific sense as being literally a biological entity.

**Page 86** Just nonsense in terms of what he claims to be doing – discussing the roots of Hitler's organicism. Who cares about this religious claptrap ? We want an extensive discussion of nineteenth century work on the social organism – Lilienfeld and Schaffle.

**Page 89** Absolutely not, using his own argument it is clear that the essential detail of Hitler's and John of Salisbury's organicist models are identical. Crucially this model is all about identity and authority fixed by *sacred* identity. To say John of Salisbury does not single out one class for vilification is to display a degree of obtuse myopia as to be beyond belief. Salisbury's whole point is that irrespective of their station any individual can be a boon or a problem, the single requirement being that all should be slaves of Judaism – Christians. Thus identity is everything for Salisbury, as it was Hitler. And both recommended the same cure – eradication/amputation. It is incredible that Musolff can so blithely summarise his own argument so falsely by simply saying what he wants to say, in total contradiction to all he has described by way of justification for his false conclusions.

**Page 90** Society as superorganism – beehive, an accurate intuitive idea of a hidden reality.

---

The fact that Salisbury used organicism as a rhetorical device makes the point that this, unlike Lilienfeld's literal idea of society as an animal, was not a model for Hitler, who clearly wanted to make his rhetoric as real as possible, albeit only for the same ends as Salisbury – that of serving/having political power as fixed on a core master (slave) identity.

**Page 92** Society could not exist without an inner force driving it to coalesce about a central point of authority – king. This idea recognises the scientific ideal of a linguistic force generating a foci of identity as master race identity = Judaism, that Hitler *pretended* to usurp for Germany – in a ridiculous show of antisemitism that is impossible to take seriously, except as a way of creating the Hitler Taboo to serve Judaism – making linguistic force retain its focus upon Jewish identity.

**Page 93** An important point to make is that [when] comparing the uses of the organicist model justifying power, [they] were only ever used to favour alternate masters, and always accepted the inherent principle of hierarchy that the organicist model makes inevitable. Hitler too only used this model for the same political end, to replace Jewish master (parasitic), with German slave identity, making Germans the masters. Musolff cannot see this last point because he can only treat Hitler's ideas at their face value – Jews as parasites, being unable to consider the real nature of this derogatory device in Hitler's hands as [being] a way of attacking his hated masters.



**Page 97**      Laws as sinews befits the idea of linguistic force creating all social form/structure, laws being an exemplary example of this fact.

**Page 98**      The subtleties of the [re]allocation of power from autocratic to ‘balanced’ (democratic), does not alter the primary intuition that the organicist model relates to, that society is a complex structure requiring a foci of authority of some kind. This intuitive insight reflects the reality of human biological corporate nature as an animal superorganism.

Note on earlier remarks about Goebbels revealing the Nazis knew they had to manipulate people craftily in order to rule them to their anti-Semitic ends. This is exactly how our British society operates today. MI6 is an internal spying organisation with nerve centres dotted about from where agents are sent to interrogate people in exactly the same way Musolff describes the SS as doing, by stealth, to find out what they really think. Recent cases have shown that police are insinuated right into the core of any civil movement that is antagonistic to core authority values – such as environmental activists that threaten capitalist interests, Musolff is innocent of all such knowledge because he is a stooge of the system, but for any that hate authority these matters reveal themselves over time.

**Page 99** This topic of headship dying with the body is of immense importance relating to the nineteenth century version of Musolff's body politic scenario. Realising that society is a true organism composed of a hierarchical structure with a master identity at its core, is the real reason why Hitler adopted the extreme stance of segregation toward the Jews. Our emphasis upon social cleansing as a key mechanism in Jewish master race programming is all about the Jews forming on the basis of a culture that was adapted to overcome precisely this problem of headship dying with a doomed social body. This insight is what nineteenth century sociological organicism made plain to all, but was never spoken of by any. Leaving the way open for Hitler to use this powerful knowledge as a political device, confident in the fact that all would understand the logic of his ideas of social parasitism and the need for a total excision. Musolff devotes himself to understanding this issue, supposedly, yet he has not got the first clue because he dare not treat the Jews as an issue to be understood in this context.

---

Thursday, 30 July 2015 – Currently working in Hull and communicating with a local philosophy group, this section of this work, and Musolff's book, talking about the function of headship within the collective body, looks like a piece to note as being of potential use in explaining the argument I have already presented asserting that the human animal is a true superorganism and the individual does not exist, as I anticipate the difficult question as to what this means, as my last post said the interesting bit was understanding how this knowledge has been controlled since it was known up to 1914.

How to put this in 1,000 digits :

Humans are a superorganic species. Language elaborates the basic structure. Human history demonstrates how language drives toward an increasingly unified, elaborate, and more powerful expression of the basic superorganic form. This involves growth by incorporation, driven by the development of the linguistic programme, at the heart of which is identity. The essence of the human corporate process is therefore a feedback loop between core identity and corporate growth. Meaning one stable identity contrasts with other comparatively ephemeral identities, making ongoing social cleansing the key to the whole process of human existence. Judaism proliferates as all others disappear ; Christianity and Islam being slave identities of Judaism, the master identity. In the social organism model science revealed this truth. A reaction then caused this knowledge to be eradicated and made taboo : the Hitler Taboo. Only by knowing the human animal is a superorganism can we see this scientific truth.

---

**Page 101** All this attention to the use of the body metaphor strikes me as pointless, it is just the way we speak as sated at the beginning, without comparison with known objects the less tangible could never be grappled with at all. Musolff however, wants the scientific idea of society as a living organism to be barred from serious consideration, and hence his determination to box it into his preconception of a mere figure of speech and nothing more.

**Page 110** That a society spawns by placing colonies in new territory is the closest to a

scientific model of a human superorganism.

**Page 111** Musolff provides an important observation on Hobbes via his definition of a state of nature being a veiled assertion of the false pivot of individuality set to contrast with the natural state humans evolved to fill, that Hobbes thereby contrives to give the usual religious myth of self madeness. This observation indicates that the crucial juxtaposition seen in all organicist accounts ever published concerns a need to contain and invert the truth, which corrupting dynamic, could be said to express Hitler's antisemitism that likewise contrives to have the Jews as responsible agents, even as he uses the model denying individuality to attain the idea of Jewish separateness. Thus Hitler's use of this 'metaphor' followed principles on knowledge control serving religion, as old as knowledge itself.

---

Saturday, 08 August 2015 – A bit obscure this, these notes being written as the work was read, must be related to the text to be understood, but, without checking the text just now, I still feel this passage might remain obscure. What I was expressing here though, is the general principle of knowledge control based on the alternative pivots of individuality versus corporate being, and how alternating between these subliminal generators of meaning allowed ideas to be generated that were informed by reality, while being wholly political in nature, and therefore serving the purpose of centralised power within the superorganism.

---

**Page 114** Hobbes is of interest as an historical figure using a crude, prescientific organicism to describe society, but I have owned his book for some years without ever doing much with it for the same reason Spencer is unreadable on the same subject – because the ideas are all so much fanciful drivel used to promote a political agenda. How anyone can study this inanity beats me, that Musolff can, shows how far his head is thrust up his own arse – metaphorically speaking.

**Page 116** Discussion of the need for one identity is a central tenet of our Atheist Science, where we say (following Hitler) there can only be one message, albeit appearing in an infinite variety of forms. In the biological context of human social structure this equates to one identity (Judaism) appearing in infinite variation, but stabilised in the three central forms of Judaism/Christianity/Islam. Hobbes recognises the necessity of this principle as a result of his organicist logic of social form – which anticipates the science of human nature – Atheist Science.

---

Sunday, 09 August 2015 – Taking a stroll into Hull yesterday, via the Old Town, I went into Wilberforce House, a museum devoted to this champion of the slave trade's doom, and the trade itself. My favourite room was a small annex with old books in glass cases, which one can only guess was the remains of Wilberforce's library, though I could see no sign saying so, it did say that the books on slavery in one cabinet were not his, as he was known not to have any books on slavery. It made me think of donating the one I have defending slavery coming up to the American Civil War, a fascinating little volume presented as sociology ! This may be *Treatise on Sociology*, Henry Hughes, 1854, I do not know without checking the actual volume at home. The section on slavery began by making the point that slavery was

widespread, saying the first society based on slavery arose in Greece three millennia ago, saying that slavery took a variety of forms. This overview is most apt for Atheist Science since here we explain what human slavery really is, as a natural expression of human corporate nature, which can be seen to be the basis of the extended superorganic form that our species clearly evolved to be.

Wilberforce came across as an interfering busy body in the main, an original Mary Whitehouse, the anti-pornography campaigner from the 70's and 80's. He attacked drinking and lewd literature, and was involved in a campaign to improve manners. He started a Bible society that continues to spread its poison today, and was a fanatical Christian, in other words a supreme slave maker !! A most revolting fellow by all appearances.

---

**Page 117** I do not recall knowing about any organicist influence on Rousseau, save for the inverted logic of the supreme individualism of his contract philosophy. To the extent that he made the social body supreme while simultaneously making the individual an absolute entity we can add him to the list of people like Hitler and Hobbes, who extol corporate ideology from the false pivot of individuality. As to Musolff's capacity to discern distinct ideas within the likes of Hobbes versus Rousseau, this loses me. It is a point of some interest however what the 'target' object was for the realisation of the corporate entity, because this did culminate in the nation vis a vis sociological organicism nineteenth century style, much to my frustration, since it is clear that religion was the true object – Judaism in fact. A couple of authors recognised Christianity as the true target, as in Fourier's follower Doherty, but none, before Hitler, identified the true object as being Judaism, and in Hitler we lose all connection with normal philosophy so that his use of the real truth is in a hidden form.

**Page 118** This healer/cure business that so fascinates Musolff because of its logic seen in Hitler's prophesying as a healer for Germany, can be related to the real dynamic of social cleansing that constantly remakes the social fabric of a slave society ruled by an alien master, in order to allow the slave identity to be constantly rejuvenated, after Hitler in Europe this rejuvenation took the form of Islamifying the biomass by the mass importation of alien slaves of Judaism as Muslims, and utilising Nazi ideology to vilify anyone who opposed this vile destruction of their sublime culture – today, 19/5/14, the UKIP leader Farage is being hounded as a racist by everyone, for voicing our anguish that our masters have performed this decades long crime against us. I'll vote UKIP on Thursday.

---

Sunday, 09 August 2015 – Since the recent general election the fact that Farage is a Christian has been made public, in that I heard it on the news, much to my disgust, but in total conformity to all we have learnt over the years about the people who are willing to be racists and antisemites, it is always the Christians who adopt this stance on the basis of defending 'our culture', as in Christianity ! It was thus in Germany under Hitler, who came to the fore in opposition to those who saw Christianity as a Jewish slave identity, so that Hitler was the 'choice' of the Jews, as all such fascists must be. This indicates the crucial role of Christianity as a second order identity of Judaism allowing a master identity to survive this kind of reaction against such identity based, mind enslavement. This means that the reaction is dissipated in a return to enslavement to Judaism, as opposed to the original culture that Judaism has cleansed, which would cause the process to be constantly returned to its starting point. Such a dynamic indicates why slave identities like Christianity and Islam evolve, as

amazing as such a result seems to be, it is because the pressure of linguistic force is pushing in this direction all the time as the alien master identity constantly strives to maintain its hold on the social body it has penetrated.

---

Rousseau clearly did make full use of an organicist model, but only to generate a political ideology the same as everyone else ever did, until the nineteenth century, when serious attempts were made (Lilienfeld) to employ organicism as a scientific sociology.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Page 119** The arrival of a full-blown parasite model for a master class is of immense significance, as in its linkage to the term 'organicism', clearly drawn from the idea of the social organism. I have never seen anything like this, but I have longed to, as evidence that people knew the Jews were a master race and Christians were their slaves. It is no step at all from this Russian expression to Hitler's version of scientific reality.

---

We obtain a point of very real interest from Musolff's account here. The transition to a scientific model that I trace back to early nineteenth century, with Comte using the phrase 'social organism' for the first time anywhere in his 1830's *Positive Science*, Musolff says Rousseau's twist on sociological organicism was informed by his naturalistic outlook, and although this predates the onset of science in the later nineteenth century, the new views on existence identified with the enlightenment, Galileo's astronomy being a key starting point, is clearly now linkable with nineteenth century sociology based on society as a natural entity, that modern science has been created to suppress. A point of interest about Rousseau's lame sociology was that its roots took life from an emerging, intuitive anthropology, forced on Europe by the discovery of primitive peoples from all around the world, this is where Rousseau got his ideas about a rugged state of feral nature requiring a contract to escape from. Idiot.

**Page 120** Musolff displays his corrupt, priestly, contrived ignorance, in all its glory by ignoring the massive movement coming between his subject so far [social organism] and Hitler, making out that the shift from an elite parasite model to Jews as parasites was utterly without reason. Nothing ever happened on earth that had a more solid and tangible reason than this connection, as we keep explaining. This shows Musolff at his corrupt worst.

**Page 121** This is an important section of the book as Musolff finally looks set to tackle the only truly relevant aspect of the whole topic of the sociologically organicist concept. In doing so we find he seeks to separate Nazi usage from the long and venerable usage of others, which rather reminds me of the modern technique of promoting Islam while condemning Islamic terror by asserting the one is an honourable tradition, while the other has absolutely nothing to do with it ! I writhe in anger when I hear this oft repeated priestly contortion. But there is the added frustration here of the fact that for us the sole reason for Nazism arising as it did was to give a perverted form to this idea [sociological organicism] in order to crush it – i. e. Hitler Taboo. For us therefore there are no discrete elements of knowledge within one social body – i. e. there is only one message, no matter how many forms it takes. Hence Islam is Judaism, and Islamic terrorism is the personification of Islam, in one vital form, and hence of Judaism in the same sense, just as Nazi antisemitism is a vital expression of the one Jewish message. Our whole view of

existence is purely scientific – totally detached from the normal personal sense of connection, we see no individuals only one unified organic being – a superorganism where all actions are of a piece, however contrary to each other they may appear to our ordinary understanding.

**Page 122** The English phrase ‘body politic’ is virtually unknown in the context of sociological organicism, the usual term being ‘social organism’. This usual term has even given way to ‘superorganism’, or at least its domain – as in ‘superorganic’ – i. e. Kroeber (1917). His insistence on ignoring this true source of Nazi organicism is staggering. Aside from this fact his idea of the nature of language that requires homing in on nuanced meaning transformations, is anathema to our scientific logic that treats language as a biological attribute, delivering a message organising individuals to form a living animal – superorganism. In our model miniscule variations in usage are irrelevant to the function of the linguistic components (words), whereas for Musolff each meaning is considered real in a literal sense, which reflects the individualistic principle that treats linguistic forms such as religions as distinct too, so that Judaism and Christianity etc. are separate things, to be treated as such – clearly a vital view in behavioural terms, but absurd from a scientific view seeking to understand why an animal has this linguistic form of behaviour.

**Page 123** Gist of Luther’s view of different parts in appearance, in reality being one whole being, is in total conformity to the scientific model and the superorganism.

---

It is of no small interest that the genuine scientific model of a superorganism should be used so consciously as the best model for organising society ! This is the highest expression of intuitive reason identifying reality in practical matters, and it is seen in all prescientific human endeavours.

**Page 126** This discussion of the history of body politic terms is fascinating as an example of what I have longed to see someone do for the phrase ‘social organism’. Reading this account makes me feel as though Musolff is in fact performing this service for us, albeit this part concerns Germany and the first use of ‘social organism’ by Comte in the 1830s is French. Very nice though, I love this horrible book. !

**Page 127** My interest in sociological organicism has led me to Herder, I bought an early nineteenth century copy of one volume of his work on humans that was a kind of early work of anthropology – *Philosophy of Man*, vol. 1, 1803. I do not recall seeing much in it but Musolff draws our attention to some very nice material that he tries to play down the value of as insightful scientifically, and in regard to Hitler’s antisemitism. I would like to read the relevant passages for myself that Berlin and Musolff dismiss as metaphysical, because given the major shift in the whole logic of Herder’s *Philosophy of Man* – i. e. genuinely anthropological, based on new insights about varieties of humans that lead to the idea of cultures as organic human wholes – a most perfect scientific insight – I am not going to let these modern fraudsters of knowledge have the last word without questioning it. Musolff’s claim regarding Herder’s idea of Jews as parasites makes no sense at all from what is said here. This twisted interpretation of Herder’s meaning tells us more about Musolff’s twisted reasoning than anything else. For Herder to say the Jews were parasites can only

mean he is giving the Diaspora state a form befitting his new scientific, biological model of human societies. The fact that he used a biological metaphor is utterly meaningless in this context !! So he knew more about mistletoe than tapeworms. He could only have in mind the Jewish culture living as the attachment to Christian societies in mind when making this wonderful remark, which does indeed speak volumes for the eruptive impetus of this idea of Jews as master race that the first person ever to see humans in this true form realised right away, but then, after over a century of massive advance in sociological organicism, not one single person more twigged to, until Hitler came along and made seeing the obvious, or even thinking anywhere near it, beyond the pale of humanity.

---

The proceeding examination of nineteenth century references to Jews as parasites are certainly intriguing, they give Hitler's usage depth, but these are not the expressions of intellectuals linked to a sociologically organicist argument. Admittedly, like Hitler, these people were demonising Jews in the age old Christian way, as enemies of Christianity. To do this was to serve Judaism because Christianity is a Jewish slave identity. This all the more shows how Hitler came to be an agent of Judaism by producing a monstrous antisemitism = Hitler Taboo. So for us this kind of evidence shows Hitler's real Christian roots – i. e. Jewish roots. Antisemitism is of course the personification of Judaism, albeit in its counter-form reserved for defending against parasitic rejection by the slave host.

**Page 128-9** This material is entirely new to me and absolutely fascinating, just the kind of thing I would hope to find in such a work, too sparse inevitably because Musolf's book is short, but the originals are a must to search for and buy if possible. It is fascinating that a form of sociological organicism should come to the fore in the Nazi German period, albeit as a throwback to its most basic modern form (Hobbes), that certainly was not the real source of Nazi organicist inspiration. If only someone of this era had taken the true source, as I do [social organism], and made a proper intellectual assessment of it – that would be my quest realised. It's not going to happen though, because no one ever wrote such a work, surely ?

**Page 129** This to and fro around the focal point of authority in a superorganic form – a human superorganism – is so much pissing into the wind, you just get back the rubbish given out. But the general logic behind this idiocy is sound, in that the central principle is that a corporate entity composed of numerous individuals must have a core foci of authority. Attempts to locate this on a false pivot of reason or collective will, arises from the usual cause of taking the correct organicist model and resting it upon the false principle of individual being – that then has somehow to be organised. But obviously from a scientific point of view the whole business of human life must be of a piece, individuals having been formed to be organised, spontaneously, and the only source for this outcome is language. Language does not deliver reason, but function ; nor collective will, but linguistic force. But all of these people, everyone and anyone ever concerned with this matter, have been dead set on making these ideas serve a political – i. e. a bias purpose. No one, before me, has ever conceived of this organicist principle as a scientific basis for understanding human nature as a natural principle.

**Page 131** This quote where Jews feed off peoples they live amongst without being part



of as their hosts slaughter one another, imparts an active dimension to the usual passive aspect of this social cleansing process that we normally assert, with Judaism, simply in terms of their surviving. The more active dimension is harder to see and justify, but it makes perfect sense and accords with the status of Jews as wheelers and dealers controlling money, and the central aspect of state power that their hosts need – i. e. war loans for arms. This part of the social cleansing dynamic is dealt with in works like Sombart, and histories describing how Portugal collapsed when it banished the Jews. It all tells a story.

**Page 132**      The peculiar thing in all of this rigmarole is that all that Schmitt need do to accuse the Jews on solid grounds is to say that Christianity is a slave identity of Judaism – but no, he wants to preserve Christianity as valid as a distinct culture separate from Judaism – and this simply because that is where power lies – he is still the opportunist – as was Hitler for some reason, and Musolff too – indeed all priests delivering the one message in its myriad of forms are viewed falsely as individuals, just opportunists. Actually they are robotic units of corporate being programmed to act opportunistically, as a robin is programmed to follow animals that ‘root’ in the ground – pig or gardener.

---

Monday, 10 August 2015 – It is nye on impossible to obtain a direct testimony of this priestly mindset, but the conversation I had with the Norwegian last week, recorded above, displays something of the mindset, as when he sees indigenous Europeans being made second class citizens in Europe by the flood of aliens who are so attached to their religions, given the immense privilege that religion is accorded by law in our society, so that his response is to suggest that perhaps people should recover their lost passion for mindless subservience to Christianity, notwithstanding that he previously said it is clear that we do not need religion anymore since we now know where we come from. But all this absurdity is due to the fixation upon the false idea that we are the objects of importance, which fails to allow the nature of this whole matter to be understood in terms of what religion exists to do, and how this relates to the status accorded it by our masters and rulers, and why the dispossessed pay so much heed to religion as the means by which they can become the newly favoured peoples. In all of this there is a dynamic of personal evaluation serving individual ends, but this dynamic is organised by the whole process of superorganic being relating to linguistic force, and the identities it generates in relation to social structure. The self serving attitude of individuals in all of this is part of their robotic manner, not a proof of their free will and decision making capacity, which is why all are content to be subservient to religion, in total disregard of truth, they have no choice.

---

Note on the historical interest in this idea – All uses of the social organicist model of society are intuitively connecting with reality but delivering their interpretation in keeping with the imperatives of this idea itself [or implicit in this idea]. This causes them to convert intuitive knowledge into a political form. ‘Political’ means ideas formed to serve the purpose of social interaction, as opposed to describing reality as it is. Obviously the political idea is described as a true account of reality as it is, and this is how the meaning of all speculation is described, most notably that of religion ! So the real lesson of this constant historical interest in the corporate idea of social being is that the core idea is real, and this explains its burst into new life in the modern scientific era. The only thing we need now is a scientific use of this model, but that is the one thing we cannot have, and it is the political interpretation at Hitler’s hands that has sealed this tragic fate for freedom [freedom defined by ‘free access to true knowledge’].

Also, obviously, all religions connect intuitively with this idea of collective being, we recognise this when we say God is an intuitive recognition of the real power we are beholding to. More than this I do have a book on corporate identity in Judaism that we might regard as a study relating to Musolf's examination of society as a corporate entity.

---

Monday, 10 August 2015 – A recent purchase, *City as Superorganism*, Barnes, 2015, notices, page 199, the way religions have some remarkable insights to impart about the reality of human existence, which is a recognition of this intuitive aspect of false knowledge as regards connecting with reality, only Barnes has no idea why this should be because he thinks we exist as ends in ourselves and knowledge therefore exists to serve us, rather than to organise us into a superorganic form by allowing us to know what we need to know to do this, without actually knowing what is real.

---

Musolf refers dismissively to the 'reconstructed' Jewish myth of explanation of Christians thus slavishly accepting the traditional taboo of antisemitism unquestioningly. Yet this gives Jews a free pass in history – never having to answer for themselves always being accepted at face value as what they say they are. This easy life in intellectual evaluations is the fruit of taboo.

---

Tuesday, 11 August 2015 – The above comment is not obviously related to page 132's contents, in the sense of the contents here being a discussion of mythology in relation to the tradition of antisemitism in Christian culture, and its mindless acceptance, as suggested by my notes. This observation in my notes must just reflect the impression this wider section on Schmitt made on me in relation to the analysis provided by Schmitt, and Musolf's handling of it.

---

His criticism of the lack of analysis as self serving bias matches all that we keep saying about his own selective *history*.

His description of Schmitt's account of the Jewish corruption of Western society's culture via liberalism, is [describes] something I cannot help being sympathetic to as an idea, though I could never peg it to the Jews. The Hippy 1960s I valued as a revolution, but this was obviously a con, undermining our culture and letting Islamic fascism penetrate under the guise of tolerance – but where did this lying, corrupt influence, come from? In Hitler's hands this form of corruption via Jews was not liberalism, but communism. Still, the general principle of Jews corrupting culture to serve their purpose has to be a logical corollary of their master race identity, their undeniable control of wealth and placement throughout all *competing* societies, the creation of slave identities in their name – Christianity/Islam, so why would they not work to subvert cultures as described here! The Jews have a purpose – to be the Chosen – and they achieve this by hitching the rest of us to this vehicle – and we are hitched up to it – the proof is therefore in the pudding.

---

Tuesday, 11 August 2015 – The Jews do not exist of course, any more than individuals do, they are merely a core structure of the human animal as superorganism, representing the biological corporate nature of the species as it is expressed at this moment in time, in the form of the existing human being bearing the Jewish identity as its own identity.

---

**Page 133** Homo sacer is portrayed as something horrific – Jews in Nazi Germany, but the description perfectly describes me in today's Britain, a person devoted to living on benefits who has been vilified and attacked by a criminal state, and forced into finding work. No doubt listeners to my complaint would say "Dear me, poor thing!" But the justice of the action does not alter the nature of the method being the normal state technique of population control. Whereas Musolff explains the whole process to make Nazism out to be something monstrous, but it was not [in this regard], it could not be, Nazi Germany had to be a perfectly normal state structure in order to exist, all it did was to redirect the machinery of state away from the usual targets of state opposition that most people consider justified, and targeted the Jews instead. This is an important point to note because it lends itself to the idea that Nazism was always designed to serve Judaism in the way it does today via the Hitler Taboo. And it also explains why people would so readily accept the state's attack on Jews, because they always accept the state waging war on some 'innocent victim', it is part of what makes their slavish conformity bearable [knowing there are others beneath them in status, worse off than they are, relative to the power that demands their subservience]. So in this section we discover some intriguing understandings of the social dynamic of statecraft that is the art of master race exploitation of a slave biomass.

**Page 134** That Nazi Germany was a hollow entity without depth, i. e. purpose, is blatantly obvious, a fact that has exercised my mind in relation to the idea that its true purpose, like its counterpart and inspiration in futile madness, the First World War, was related to the real core of power, Judaism, that needed a major act of social cleansing to regain its hold on its European slave biomass, and a taboo to seal off the root problem of linguistic force generating true knowledge in the form of sociological organicism. So the purpose in both these acts of apparent social wide, collective insanity, was the same eternal purpose that acts on us all the time – the drive to form and maintain a superorganism centred on a foci of identity – Judaism – expressed in the Jewish purpose of being the Chosen of all humanity. These commentators can see the hollowness and even try to analyse it, but without a functional model to fit the horror into, all they can do is spew forth their own hollow ideas in imitation of the driving force of Nazism, that is Judaism.

---

'the absolute Other' – intriguing phrase – i. e. the real human superorganism that he says is beyond human control – indeed, it controls us, that is the whole point of our Atheist Science reasoning, as it must be of any genuine science of humanity. And again, the beauty of Nazism realising this rightly and in all its horror, is that it suggests that we can control the superorganism and normally do, under the authority of religion, i. e. Judaism, and hence this open monstrosity serves to make the normal face of the monster our beloved condition. Which further extends the idea of the taboo beyond the negative antisemitism, to the positive of established political order.

---

Wednesday, 12 August 2015 – Nice observations on my part but slightly obscure in places. Obviously religion is an act of self control on the part of the human animal, if it is any kind of control, which it isn't really. Religion is the programme controlling us to form the superorganism.

**Page 135** Note that this Nazi period sociological organicist did not use the body politic

terminology based on somatic anatomy, but rather the social organism figure of the society as organism – a whole animal being. But this important fact is barely indicated here, we have to draw it out to make anything of it.

---

Nazism doomed to perish, as we were just saying, it never had any substance, any point, so what was it there for ? It was created by linguistic force in a Jewish society, to serve Judaism, which is what it did – big time – establishing the state of Israel, and has continued to do, as a taboo and as a positive mantra for globalisation that we are all condemned as racists if we object to – Monday 26 May 2014 – yesterday UKIP took 23 seats in Europe because we so hate the consequences of the Hitler's work for Judaism.

**Page 136** Musolff's belittling of the significance of the three works resurrecting the figure of seventeenth century body politic imagery will not do . I have ordered these three books and will examine them for signs of modern, scientific sociological organism based on the idea of the social organism. But while the fact that these writers skipped nineteenth century organicism that I say was the true source of Nazi sociological organicism, and the reason for this idea being in the public consciousness and hence the reason these three use it, lends weight to Musolff's position, I maintain that even here this shows that Hitler and the Nazi movement were as keen to suppress true sociological organicism as anyone. This is what made the Nazis true servants of Judaism in the end. This is why the end result of all these historical events was the Hitler Taboo whose jackboot we live under today, in the name of Judaism of course, since Nazism – always destined to vanish in a puff of smoke – went out of existence as soon as it came in. And of course the genocide of the Nazis against the Jews was a vital aspect of Nazism *for the Jews*, for Nazism to be of real service to the Jews. Without the holocaust what would we have by way of inheritance from the Nazis ? – nothing, just more of the same stupidity – another crazed Napoleon figure etc. etc. – but the holocaust changed all that and made the Nazis special, and so this period lives on with us, massively, to this day, still serving global Judaism.

Openly attacks any rational logic to Nazis antisemitism, again. Does so from within the confines of the metaphor as real phenomenon, as opposed to being a description of something real. The idea of society as a natural entity is however absolutely real, and in its metaphoric form it constitutes an intuitive recognition of reality from which logical imperatives are implied, and can be rendered absolutely true once we have a true scientific model of society. A predictive (teleological) dimension is therefore wholly valid, but it can only be unravelled by science, revealing that society is hierarchical and ruled by a master race to which all are enslaved, so that genocidal acts form a routine physiological aspect of superorganic life and the realisation of a political idea of these things is likely to result in a genocidal activity, exactly as it did with the Nazis because this is what gives the Nazis their purpose as Jews. Because the Nazis, just like the rest of us are, were really Jews too.

**Page 137** States the crucial points about this scientific model of human biological nature being made taboo by association with the Nazis and tries to say that science has made it ridiculous, when it is the only valid model of human biological nature. This passage is in effect a justification of the Hitler Taboo, where he also states the link between sociological organicism's taboo status and its association with antisemitism.

---

Core authority no longer exists ! Rubbish, it is Jewish identity, as it has always been. Divide and conquer is the mechanism of priestcraft being employed here, i. e. individualism.

Friday, 21 August 2015 – Jewish identity being the form in which human biological corporate nature operating via the power of linguistic force currently manifests itself.

**Page 138**      ‘master illnesses’ ! A nice turn of phrase.

---

Parasitism ... in view of the result ... – delivers a gob full of academic jargon giving an air of high-minded intellectualism, but it sums up the core bullshit argument of this work, dead set on detaching this *eternally* present idea (in all cultures he says), from any basis in reality. I am living proof that this idea can come from nowhere (specific), [As is the artist Barnes, *City as Superorganism*, 2015.], having had a flash of inspiration that humans were superorganisms it took me two years to find a link into the expansive world of this idea. But the fact that he can talk so freely of this idea’s dismissal by intellectuals and its fall from collective memory unwittingly reveals the exact method of our masters in relation to this eternally emerging idea. They cannot eradicate it because it is true science, so they took possession of it, as they do with all true knowledge – most notably evolution, and make it monstrous – Hitler, or ridiculous – Darwin.

**Page 139**      As already remarked this idea of language as carrying meaning that people are conscious of is utter rubbish. Language evolves from one root to another and leaves that root behind almost immediately, otherwise language would be impossible to use as a form of software controlling robotic minds that accept what is said to them in the moment. The roots of language are fascinating, to me, but no one has any awareness of these roots in the ordinary course of use. This is especially important in relation to the fact that all words carry a bias ‘impulse of meaning’ derived from the false pivot of observation that says we are individuals, it is vital that we are not aware of this ludicrous bias, as, if we were aware of it we might question it, which would destroy our robotic status and make the human animal impossible to create [efficiently, as per our evolved biological nature]. The underlying idea of his intellectual model is the obscure psychological jargon phrase ‘cognitive’ conception (can’t recall or find his actual phrase). This is the individualised form of our scientific ‘linguistic identity programme’, that organises individuals to form the human animal. And we see the crossover between the false individualism and our true corporatism in this idea of a continuity of meaning, the only difference is that he makes this individual by assuming a consciousness of linguistic roots, where we make contemporary linguistic usage a programme delivering a covert message to obey an imbued [into language as ‘meaning’] directive (think of yourselves and everyone as individuals) by denying an awareness of the underlying meaning of words. Clearly we are right and he is just blabbering, because no one except a few academics knows the roots of modern words [And in point of fact we might wonder at how complete and accurate their knowledge is of this topic, they certainly have no proper basic model of what language is to allow them to apply themselves properly to their subject.]

**Page 140**      Intriguing observation that Greek social based root meaning provided the

modern biological meaning – something I had read before, long ago, but certainly not remembered myself. Which goes to demonstrate all that we have been saying about covert meanings not being known – which he actually concedes here.

---

Uses the contrived, false, derogatory term, ‘Social Darwinist’, to covertly define nineteenth century ideas on the social organism, that were not all Social Darwinist in their nature until the likes of Hitler gave them a political form linked to race.

---

Finally, unintentionally, makes nineteenth century scientific ideas of society as biological entity the real origin of Hitler’s organicism ! *Yes*. This should of been his starting point and the total substance of his book, as a work supposedly dealing with Nazi ideas of society as biological entity.

---

The fact that people still speak of the inheritance of personal qualities in terms of blood relations does not mean that we think of blood as literally performing this biological role ! Idiot. It is just how intuitive knowledge of reality forms our linguistic identity programme. This man is a pedantic moron, i. e. a moron born of being fanatically linguistically pedantic – taking meaning as a form of reality, which it is not – the word is not the thing.

---

Monday, 24 August 2015 – In our Atheist Science model meaning is given its true identity as a reality, because we treat it as a functional component of a biological programme, just as a genetic code contains instructions that equate to linguistic meanings. In this scientific sense meaning is a form of reality, but used in its familiar sense meaning is not real, taken at face value, linguistic meaning is the appearance we see, that in reality is something we do not see ordinarily. Hence all our talk of covert meaning and words carrying a bias load, such as the imperative of individuality, the primary bias load, impelling us to always think in terms of ourselves as ends in ourselves, causing us to obey a programme that makes us act in a coordinated manner that delivers a collective outcome by performing individual tasks that deliver coordination as a product of their localised action informed by an underlying common imperative that no person knows directly, but only indirectly via the programme, so they know they do God’s will, for example, which is really the imperative of human biological corporate nature expressed in linguistic form.

**Page 141** No it does not. This is building castles in the sky, like devising a game/jigsaw puzzle of many pieces and then saying playing the game is dealing with something real – i. e. existing naturally and prior to the player’s creation of it. Like creating a myth – i. e. a religion and then studying it as if its account described something real, e. g. Noah’s Ark – a fictional story treated as real – where did it land !! Turkey ? This is Musolff with his metaphors, treating them as some kind of self existing reality, a kind of artifact of the mind that exists as an archaeological object of thought that can be unearthed and studied as an object. All this is in keeping with the false logic of individualism that erases all connections between ideas because they are possessions of individuals, not something existing as part of a super individual reality and therefore actually valid in the present, i. e. alive now, which these ‘metaphors’ in fact are, as part of the human animal’s identity programme.

---

Reiterates the key question about the link between organicism and genocide – was the connection necessary to enable genocide ! Twat. Cart before the horse. The genocide was

necessary to eradicate the knowledge of the Jews as master race inherent in the scientific conception of a social organism. So the answer is yes, the link is vital, but the dynamic is opposite to that assumed in the question, i. e. Organicism did not exist to enable genocide, genocide was created to disable science, and thereby the false upfront face of the master race – Nazis – was a glimpse of the true visage of the real master race – Jews. The way he talks of the goal of genocide begs the question Why ? Why this gaol ? Which he glides right over, simply accepting it as a fact to be treated as a kind of pathological madness, beyond the possibility of asking why as no rational explanation can exist.

**Page 142** Hint of a possible answer – the extermination of Jews was necessary for victory – for the health of German nation – but, Why the Jews ? Traditional scapegoat would be the typical reply here, but still no real answer – Why the Jews ? Why did they exist in this antagonistic form ? Why hadn't they been assimilated or disappeared in some other way like all other cultures on earth ? Obviously because of their Jewish link to Christianity. Christianity kept Judaism alive – i. e. formed the host body within which Jews lived, and this reality is what created the Nazi genocide, to suppress its being known as it had become known via the science of society based upon the idea of the social organism.

**Page 143** Alludes to the user of the organicist model not daring to draw its obvious conclusion – i. e. the Jews are the master race, an observation we often mention as applying to all nineteenth century sociologically organicist work. Only letting this truth emerge in Hitler, to ensure it could never be accepted if anyone did eventually say it, as I have. Schmitt's book arrived yesterday (31/5/14), and I may read it next to see how a German of this era handled the organicist idea, albeit still not dealing with the true source of Nazi organicism – the nineteenth century idea of the social organism.

---

These four common themes are of vital importance, hierarchy, structural interdependence of elements, existence only being found in the totality of the structural hierarchy, and finally the invocation of pathology. The first three are true scientific facts, the last is the added, bias political mechanism making this intuitive grasp of reality functional within the linguistic identity programme organising the formation of the whole being under one identity – Judaism. When Musolff speaks of these three primary factors forming mythological content and representing God's form ! (nice), he speaks of these things as I do – without deriving any benefit thereby however, because he fails to see that this intuitive sense of reality codified into myth forming the basis of political power by connecting authority to the real basis of social order, is a description of actual reality only needing modern science to state it in scientific terms, which is what Hitler's political usage makes impossible, thereby extinguishing the former political usage seen in the fourth common factor, which is the basis of Jewish power as a master race [their parasitism], this being what makes Hitler a supreme saviour of Judaism [the exposure of their parasitism in a heinous, *political* form.].

---

Hitler's politics were plausible because of their organicism – OK. But this he ludicrously justifies because of the age old usage of the *body politic* idea. NO!!! It was because of the continually alive, modern idea of the social organism that revealed a great truth that no intellectual dared speak of – as with Schmitt, that Hitler took as his own in order to destroy it and save Judaism thereby. Did Hitler know he was saving Judaism ? This is the age old question arising in Atheist Science, that we answer by invoking individual nonexistence that

does not require such awareness in order to be effected, but it could of been present, we cannot answer this question, ever, in any case of an individual's subservience to the message.

---

Wednesday, 26 August 2015 – I just examined a book yesterday that in many ways is all about this subject of obedience to the message, and our awareness of it, although the author has no idea that this is what they have been devoting their life to the study of. *Social : Why our brains are wired to connect*, Matthew Lieberman, 2013, adopts an ultra individualist stance automatically, mindlessly, as a matter of course, and proceeds to force all reasoning through this false logic, even though this subject is entirely rooted in the true logic that the human animal is a superorganism, not the individual. A quick dip into this book located some nice sections. A common 'error' in works that deal substantially with the absolute truth, but via the false pivot of individuality, is found here, where he says "evolution is moving us ever closer to interdependent social living" (p. 191). Which is like saying that something, any product of a complex operation, like a book, is moving closer to being a piece of literature as it shifts from its original hand made form to the modern digital product. Clearly this is idiotic, denying the nature of the book, and that is what Lieberman is doing here, denying that human biological nature exists, even as he deals with it by pretending it is seemingly where we are headed as we change from being free individuals, into units of a superorganic being, as hinted at here. We see this angle of reality mooted by being set in the future employed in all works of this kind over the decades, if not centuries. But it is still a nice work to see coming out of modern scientific methods as it backs up our Atheist Science massively, irrespective of the fact that it has no intention of doing so.

**Page 143-4** Here we have the culminating purpose of the book, excusing the German people for *choosing* Hitler.

**Page 144** Speaking of Hitler's 'presentation' here, shows a passive, moronic acceptance of Hitler and Nazism taken at face value, which shows a total lack of understanding of human social nature, which never reveals its true intentions at the political level, but always works according to a covert agenda understood by the priests i. e. politicians in this case. As with the secret agenda of European unification only ever talked about in immediate personal terms of financial benefit, that these rulers know is the farthest thing from their mind as they seek one global society ruled by Judaism – something that politicians do not know themselves, but others must know – Jews, Christian leaders – Pope – who knows who knows ?

---

The concluding comparison continues to exclude the only relevant source [of Nazi organicism] – nineteenth century organicism based on the idea of the social organism, making a nonsense of this summary, and the whole book.

---

Thursday, 27 August 2015 – Just reading this passage again today to try and make sense of my notes' odd opening phraseology, I see that in his three part summation Musolff presented Hitler as unique because of his absolute application of the organicist model of society, which application emulates our own use of this model as a true science, which is indeed absolute, and as such it makes perfect sense that Hitler should of been absolute in this manner. Which



also reinforces our view that this supreme science of humanity only found its culmination in Hitler as a philosopher, and Nazism as a political ideology, and this because science was suppressed by the authority of religion, as it always is, and always must be for religion to exist. So that the unique absolutism of Hitler in regard to organicist ideas, identified by Musolff, is a reflection of the source of his organicist model that is the theme of this work, which was knowledge of a truly scientific kind applied to humans, something that had never been seen before in human history. This is the culminating revelation of Musolff's study, which we perceive, but Musolff is oblivious to.

## **Chapter One**

### **The Nature of Taboo**

#### **I**

##### **Alternative pivots of observation**

In straightforward colloquial parlance a taboo is something not to be done, and more often it is something not to be spoken of, than actually done. My recollection of the meaning of this word is that it derived from anthropological investigations that found the practice of taboo was a dominant cultural feature of Polynesian islanders. We could digress into a consideration of this topic to without feeling we had gone amiss, except that it is surely one that can be readily looked into should one wish. All we need do here is lead up to the meaning that this word 'taboo' signifies according to our own use of it, and that we have just done.

What we would like to do, is to provide our own understanding of the meaning of this word, which is of a radically different kind to any that will be found employed anywhere else. The cultural nature of taboo is given, but what is the meaning of this cultural nature, why do cultures generate no go areas for their members to obey ? I must confess that I am not terribly interested in what academics have to say on this subject because my ideas are so radically antagonistic to academic authority that I know that however wonderful some analysis might be they will always be entirely useless for my purposes.

I have written extensively over the years on the alternative idea of human nature that is my philosophical outlook, and the primary feature of my alternative natural science of human biological nature rests upon what I have called an 'alternative pivot of observation'. The two pivots of human biological nature rest upon the conception of the human animal that we recognise. The idea we hold to is so unique to myself that it is unlikely that anyone will ever of had the thought or of come across it, unless they have previously come across my own work.

---





